


LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

C BR 165 .R38213 1875 v.3
S Renan, Ernest, 1823-1892.
B The history of the origins
of Christianity ...







**NEW WORKS,
By ERNEST RENAN.**

Uniform with this volume, price \$1 75.

I.—THE LIFE OF JESUS.

II.—THE APOSTLES.

III.—SAINT PAUL.

The works of Ernest Renan are of great power and learning,
earnestly and honestly written, beautiful in style,
admirable in treatment, and filled with
reverence, tenderness, and
warmth of heart.

••• *Single copies sent by mail, free, on receipt of price, by*

CARLETON, PUBLISHER,

New York.

SAINT PAUL.

(1865)

BY

ERNEST RENAN,

MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT.

AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE OF JESUS," "THE APOSTLES," ETC.

Translated from the Original French by

INGERSOLL LOCKWOOD.



NEW YORK:

G. W. CARLETON, PUBLISHER.

PARIS: MICHEL LEVY FRERES.

MDCCCLXXV.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1863, by
GEORGE W. CARLETON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

JOHN F. TROW & SON, PRINTERS,
205-213 EAST 12TH ST., NEW YORK.

TO

CORNELIA SCHEFFER.

WE have visited together Ephesus and Antioch, Philippi and Thessalonica, Athens and Corinth, Colossæ and Laodicea. Never, upon these difficult and dangerous routes, did I hear thee murmur; as in our journeyings, so in the free pursuit of truth, thou hast never said to me, "Pause." At Seleucia, upon the disjointed blocks of the old mole, we somewhat envied the apostles who set out from there to conquer the world, filled with so fervent a faith in the speedy coming of the kingdom of God. Of a truth, those expectations of something material and near at hand infused into their action an energy which we no longer possess. But, though less determined in form, still is our faith in the ideal reign none the less strong. All is symbol and dream here below. Descartes was right in not believing in the reality of the world until he had satisfied himself of the existence of God. Kant was right in doubting everything until he had discovered duty. Our youth has witnessed days

(v)

of sorrow, and I am fearful that Fate has stored up no good for us in this world. A few grievous errors are working the ruin of our country. Those warned of them, smile. In the hour of trial, be for me what thou wast when we visited the seven Churches of Asia,—the faithful companion who never withdraws her hand from the one which it has once clasped.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
DEDICATION	3
INTRODUCTION. — <i>Critical Examination of Original Documents</i>	9
CHAPTER I. — <i>First Journey of St. Paul. — Mission of Cyprus</i> .	49
CHAPTER II. — <i>Continuation of the First Journey of St. Paul. — Mission of Galatia</i>	59
CHAPTER III. — <i>First Trouble arising from Circumcision</i> . .	73
CHAPTER IV. — <i>Secret Propagation of Christianity. — Its Introduction into Rome</i>	92
CHAPTER V. — <i>Second Journey of St. Paul. — Second Sojourn in Galatia</i>	100
CHAPTER VI. — <i>Continuation of the Second Journey of St. Paul. — Mission of Macedonia</i>	109
CHAPTER VII. — <i>Continuation of the Second Journey of St. Paul. — Paul at Athens</i>	124
CHAPTER VIII. — <i>Continuation of the Second Journey of St. Paul. — First Sojourn at Corinth</i>	145
CHAPTER IX. — <i>Continuation of the Second Journey of St. Paul. — First Epistles. — Interior State of the New Churches</i> .	153
CHAPTER X. — <i>Return of Paul to Antioch. — Dispute between Peter and Paul. — Counter Mission organized by James, brother of the Lord</i>	176

	PAGE
CHAPTER XI.— <i>Troubles in the Churches of Galatia</i> . . .	192
CHAPTER XII.— <i>Third Journey of Paul.—Establishment of the Church of Ephesus</i>	204
CHAPTER XIII.— <i>Progress of Christianity in Asia and Phrygia</i>	214
CHAPTER XIV.— <i>Schisms in the Church of Corinth.—Apollos.—First Scandals</i>	222
CHAPTER XV.— <i>Continuation of the Third Mission of Paul.—The Great Collection.—Departure from Ephesus</i> . . .	251
CHAPTER XVI.— <i>Continuation of the Third Mission.—Second Sojourn of Paul in Macedonia</i>	261
CHAPTER XVII.— <i>Continuation of the Third Mission.—Second Sojourn of Paul at Corinth.—The Epistle to the Romans.</i>	272
CHAPTER XVIII.— <i>Return of Paul to Jerusalem</i>	292
CHAPTER XIX.— <i>Last Sojourn of Paul at Jerusalem.—His Arrest</i>	298
CHAPTER XX.— <i>Captivity of Paul at Cesarea of Palestine</i> . . .	312
CHAPTER XXI.— <i>Voyage of the Prisoner Paul</i>	319
CHAPTER XXII.— <i>A Glance at the Work of Paul</i>	325
NOTES	331

SAINT PAUL.

INTRODUCTION.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

THE fifteen or sixteen years of which this volume contains the religious history, are, of the embryonic age of Christianity, those best known to us. Jesus and the primitive Church of Jerusalem resemble the images of a distant paradise, lost in a mysterious haze. On another side, the arrival of St. Paul in Rome, in consequence of the resolution taken by the author of the *Acts* to conclude his narrative at this moment, indicates, in respect to the history of the origins of Christianity, the commencement of a profound night, into which the gory glimmer of the barbarous festivities of Nero and the thunderbolt of the Apocalypse alone throw some light. In particular, is the death of the apostles enveloped in an impenetrable obscurity. On the contrary, the time of the missions of Paul, especially of the second and third mission, is known to us through documents of the greatest value. The *Acts*, up to this so legendary, suddenly become quite substantial; the last chapters, composed in part of the account of an eye-witness, are the only completely historical narrative of the first years of Christianity in our possession. Finally, by a privilege very rare in such a subject, these years offer us dated documents, of absolute authenticity; a series of letters, the most important of which are proof against all criticism, and which have never undergone any interpolations.

In the introduction to the preceding volume, we made an

examination of the book of the *Acts*. We are now to discuss, in due order, the different epistles which bear the name of St. Paul. The apostle tells us himself that already in his day false letters¹ were circulating in his name, and he frequently takes the precaution to prevent the frauds.² Hence we do nothing more than conform to his intentions by submitting the writings presented to us, as from him, to a severe ordeal. There are fourteen of these epistles in the New Testament, and we must begin by classifying them into two categories. Thirteen of these writings contain the name of the apostle as superscription, in the text of the letter; in other words, these letters purport to be themselves the work of Paul; and so conclusively, too, that there is no choice left us between these two hypotheses, — either that Paul is in reality their author, or that they are the work of a fabricator, who wished to make his compositions pass for a production of Paul's. The fourth epistle, on the contrary, — the one to the Hebrews, — bears no superscription;³ the author enters upon his subject without naming himself. The ascription of this epistle to Paul is founded solely upon tradition.

The thirteen epistles which themselves purport to be the work of Paul, may, in regard to authenticity, be arranged in five classes: —

First. Epistles unquestionable and unquestioned; namely, the epistle to the Galatians, the two epistles to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Romans.

Second. Certain epistles to which, however, objections have been raised; namely, the two epistles to the Thessalonians and the epistle to the Philippians.

Third. Epistles of probable authenticity, although open to grave objections; namely, the epistle to the Colossians, to which is annexed the note to Philemon.

Fourth. Doubtful epistle; namely, the epistle to the Ephesians.

Fifth. False epistles; namely, the two epistles to Timothy and the epistle to Titus.

We have nothing to say here concerning the epistles of the first category ; the most exacting critics, such as Christian Bauer, accept them without objection. Nor shall we scarcely dwell upon the epistles of the second class. The difficulties which certain ones of modern times have raised against them consist in those slight suspicions which it is the duty of criticism to express freely, but not to dwell upon when more cogent reasons oppose it. Now these three epistles possess a character of authenticity which overcomes every other consideration. The only serious difficulty which has been raised against the epistles to the Thessalonians results from the theory of Anti-Christ, expounded in the second chapter of the second epistle, — a theory apparently identical with that of the Apocalypse, and which would consequently lead us to suppose that Nero was already dead when the piece was written. But this objection permits itself to be overcome, as we shall see in the course of the present volume. The author of the Apocalypse did nothing more than apply to his day a collection of ideas, one part of which dated back to the very sources of the Christian belief, while the other was introduced toward the time of Caligula.

The epistle to the Colossians has been subjected to the test of much graver objections. Certain it is that expressions made use of in this epistle to designate the *rôle* of Jesus in the bosom of the Divinity, as Creator and prototype of all creation,⁴ show very plainly alongside of the language of certain epistles, and appear to favor the style of the writings attributed to John. In reading such passages, we imagine ourselves in complete gnosticism.⁵ The language of the epistle to the Colossians does not follow that of certain epistles ; the expressions are somewhat different ;⁶ the style has more emphasis and roundness, less of transport and feeling ; at times, it is embarrassed, declamatory, overladen, analogous to the style of the false epistles to Timothy and Titus. The thoughts are about such as might be expected from Paul. Nevertheless, justification through faith no longer occupies the first place in the prepossessions of the

apostle; the theory of angels is much more developed; the cons begin to arise.⁷ The redemption of the Messiah is no longer a mere terrestrial fact; it comprehends the entire universe.⁸ Certain critics have deemed it in their power to point out, in several passages, either imitations of other epistles⁹ or the desire to conciliate the particular tendency of Paul with the views of schools different from his own (a desire so evident with the author of the *Acts*), or the inclination to substitute moral and metaphysical formulas, such as love and science, for the formulas concerning the faith and the works, which during the first century had caused so many struggles. Other critics, in order to explain this strange *mélange* of things suitable to Paul and of things ill-suited to him, have recourse to interpolations, or suppose that Paul entrusted to Timothy the putting in order of the epistle in question. It is certain that when we strive to engraft this epistle and the one to the Philippians upon a continued narrative of Paul's life, the thing does not entirely succeed, as with the great and indubitably authentic epistles anterior to the captivity of Paul. With the latter, the operation, so to speak, performs itself; the facts and the texts fit one into the other without effort, and seem to call each other. With the epistles of the captivity, on the contrary, more than one laborious combination is needed, more than one unwillingness is to be silenced;¹⁰ the comings and goings of the disciples are not in harmony at the first; many circumstances of time and place present themselves, if we may be allowed the expression, the wrong way.

Nothing in all this, however, is decisive. If the epistle to the Colossians is the work of Paul (as we believe it to be), it was written in the latter part of the apostle's life, at a period in which his biography is very obscure. Later, we shall demonstrate it to be very admissible that the theology of St. Paul, which, from the epistles to the Thessalonians to the epistle to the Romans, was so materially developed, should also undergo further development in the interval from the epistle to the

Romans to his death. We shall even demonstrate that the most energetic expressions in the epistle to the Colossians are but slight embellishments upon those of anterior epistles.¹¹ St. Paul was one of those men, who, from their cast of mind, are inclined to pass from one order of ideas to another, although their style and manner of thinking present the most definite characteristics. The tinge of gnosticism found in the epistle to the Colossians is met with, although less characterized, in the other writings of the New Testament, especially in the Apocalypse and epistle to the Hebrews.¹² Instead of rejecting the authenticity of the passages in the New Testament in which traces of gnosticism are met with, we must sometimes reason inversely, and search these passages for the origin of the gnostic ideas which prevailed in the second century. We might say, in one sense, that these ideas were anterior to Christianity, and that primitive Christianity made more than one loan from them. In short, the epistle to the Colossians, although full of singularities, does not contain any of those impossibilities presented by the epistles to Titus and Timothy: it even possesses many characteristics which repel the hypothesis of a fabrication. Of this number, we may mention its connection with the note to Philemon. If the epistle be apocryphal, the note is also apocryphal; for few pages have a tone of such decided sincerity; Paul alone, as far as it appears, was able to write this little masterpiece. The apocryphal epistles of the New Testament, —for example, those to Timothy and Titus,—are awkward and heavy; the epistle to Philemon in no wise resembles these tedious *pasticcios*.

In conclusion, we shall ere long discover that the so-called epistle to the Ephesians is in part copied from the epistle to the Colossians,—a fact that seems to argue that the editor of the so-called epistle to the Ephesians must have regarded the epistle to the Colossians as an apostolic original. Let us also remark that Marcion, who was generally so well inspired in all matters of criticism relating to the writings of Paul, and who

so justly rejected the epistles to Titus and Timothy, admitted into his collection the two epistles of which we have just been speaking.¹³

Infinitely stronger are the objections that can be raised against the so-called epistle to the Ephesians. And first, let us observe that this designation is no less than certain. The epistle possesses absolutely no stamp of circumstantiality; it is addressed to no one in particular; those for whom it is destined occupy less place in Paul's thoughts than his other correspondents of the time being.¹⁴ Can we admit that St. Paul would have written to a Church with which he had had such intimate connections without saluting any one, — without expressing to the faithful the salutations of the brethren of his acquaintance, Timothy in particular, — without giving any advice to his disciples, — without speaking to them of former relations, — without embodying in the writing any of those particular characteristics which give the impress of authenticity to the other epistles? ¹⁵ The writing is addressed to converted heathen. Now, the Church of Ephesus was to a great extent Jewish-Christian. When we reflect with what eagerness Paul, in all his epistles, both profits by and gives rise to pretexts under which to speak of his ministry and preaching, we experience a lively surprise at seeing him, in the whole course of a letter addressed to these same Ephesians, "whom for three years he did not cease to exhort day and night with tears," lose all the opportunities afforded him to recall to them his sojourn among them, — at seeing him, I say, persist in giving himself entirely up to abstract philosophy, or, what is stranger still, to pointless formulas, suitable for the first church they reached.¹⁶ How different he is in the epistles to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Philippians, to the Thessalonians, and even in the epistle to those Colossians whom the apostle, however, only knew indirectly! The epistle to the Romans is the only one which in this respect slightly resembles the one in question. Like it, the epistle to the Romans is a complete, doctrinal *exposé*; while,

in the epistles addressed to readers who have received the Gospel from him, Paul always infers that the rudiments of his instruction are known, and contents himself with dwelling upon some point which possesses appropriateness. How does it happen, that, of the only two impersonal letters of Paul, one should be an epistle addressed to a church which he had never seen,¹⁷ and the other an epistle addressed to a church with which he had had the longest and most uninterrupted connection?

The perusal of the so-called epistle to the Ephesians will therefore be sufficient to lead us to suspect that the writing in question was not addressed to the Church of Ephesus. The testimony of the manuscripts transforms these suspicions into certainty. The words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, in the first verse, were introduced towards the end of the fourth century. The manuscript of the Vatican and the *Codex Sinaiticus*, both of the fourth century, and the authority of which, at least when they accord, prevails over that of all the other manuscripts together, do not contain these words. A manuscript of Vienna, — the one designated in the collections of Paul's epistles by the figure 67, — of the eleventh or twelfth century, has them erased. St. Basil gives us the testimony that the ancient manuscripts examined by him did not have these words.¹⁸ Finally, the evidence of the third century proves that at that period the existence of the said words in the first verse was not known.¹⁹ If, at that time, everybody believed that the epistle in question had been addressed to the Ephesians,²⁰ it was by virtue of its title, and not by virtue of the superscription. A man who, in spite of the dogmatic *à priori* spirit frequently manifested by him in correcting the holy works, often had gleams of true criticism, namely, Marcion (towards 150), desired that the so-called epistle to the Ephesians should be the epistle to the Laodiceans, of whom St. Paul speaks in the epistle to the Colossians.²¹ What appears most true, is, that the so-called epistle to the Ephesians was addressed to no particular church, and that, if it be from St. Paul, it is simply a circular letter destined for the churches of

Asia, composed of converted heathen. The superscription of these letters, transcribed in several copies, might offer after the words *τοῖς οὖσιν*, a blank destined to receive the name of the church intended. Perhaps the Church of Ephesus possessed one of these copies, of which the editor of Paul's letters may have made use. The fact of finding such a copy at Ephesus would have induced him to write at the head *Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους*.²² As they neglected, in the start, to leave a blank after *οὖσιν*, the superscription became: *τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς*, not a very satisfactory lesson,²³ and one which they may have thought to rectify in the fourth century by inserting after *οὖσιν*, conformably to the title, the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*.

This doubt concerning those for whom was destined the so-called epistle to the Ephesians might accord very well with its authenticity; but on this second point, critical reflection gives rise to new suspicions. One fact which attracts attention at the very start is the resemblances which we remark between the so-called epistle to the Ephesians and the epistle to the Colossians. The two epistles are identical in outline; members of sentences have passed unchanged from one to the other. Which is the epistle that served as the original, and which are we to consider an imitation?

It certainly appears that it is the epistle to the Colossians which serves as the original, and that it is the so-called epistle to the Ephesians which is the imitation. This second epistle is more developed; ²⁴ its formulas are exaggerated; everything that distinguishes the epistle to the Colossians among the epistles of St. Paul is still more strongly marked in the so-called epistle to the Ephesians. The epistle to the Colossians is full of particular details; it has an introductory which corresponds well to the historical circumstances under which it must have been written. The epistle to the Ephesians is entirely vague. We understand how a general catechism might be taken from a particular letter, but not how a particular letter could be taken from a general catechism. Finally, the twenty-first verse of the

sixth chapter of the so-called epistle to the Ephesians takes it for granted that the epistle to the Colossians was the first written.²⁵ As soon as we admit the epistle to the Colossians to be a work of Paul's, the question puts itself as follows : How could Paul pass his time in disfiguring one of his works, in repeating himself, in making a common letter out of a topical and particular one ?

This is not exactly impossible ; but it is quite improbable. The improbability of such an idea would be diminished by supposing that Paul entrusted the work to one of his disciples. Perhaps Timothy, for example, may have taken the epistle to the Colossians, in order to enlarge it, and thus render it general and susceptible of being addressed to all the churches of Asia. It is difficult to pronounce an opinion upon the matter with confidence ; for the supposition remains that the epistle was composed after the death of Paul, at a period in which they were engaged in searching for the apostolic writings, and in which, when taking into consideration the small number of these writings, they did not scruple to fabricate new ones by imitating, mingling together, copying, and diluting the writings deemed apostolic at that time. Thus, the so-called second epistle of Peter was made up of the *I. Petri* and the epistle of Jude. It is possible that the so-called epistle to the Ephesians owes its origin to the same proceeding.²⁶ The objections raised against the epistle to the Colossians, in relation to language and doctrines, apply with greater force to the former. The epistle to the Ephesians, in regard to style, differs sensibly from certain epistles : it contains favorite expressions, meanings peculiar to it alone, words foreign to the ordinary language of St. Paul, some of which are met with again in the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews.²⁷ The sentences are diffuse, lacking in vigor, laden with useless words and repetitions, entangled with adventitious incidents, and full of pleonasm and incumbrances.²⁸ Same difference at the basis of the ideas. In the so-called epistle to the Ephesians, gnosticism is entirely apparent.²⁹ The idea of

the church, conceived as a living organism,³⁰ is here developed in a manner which carries the mind back to the years 75 or 80; the exegesis no longer conforms to the customary ways of Paul;³¹ the manner in which the "holy apostles"³² are spoken of is surprising; the theory of marriage is different from that which Paul sets forth to the Corinthians.³³

It must be confessed, on the other hand, that one cannot well imagine the design and interest which the fabricator would have had in composing this piece, since it adds very little to the epistle to the Colossians. It appears, moreover, that a fabricator would have indited a letter, properly addressed and circumstantiated, as is the case with the epistles to Timothy and Titus. That Paul wrote or dictated this letter is almost impossible to admit; but that it was composed while he was yet alive, under his eyes, in his name, is not to be declared improbable. Paul, a prisoner at Rome, might commission Tychicus to go and visit the churches of Asia,³⁴ giving him several letters, the epistle to the Colossians, the note to Philemon, and the epistle, now lost, to the Laodiceans.³⁵ He might also give him copies of a sort of circular letter, with the name of the church left blank, which letter would be the so-called epistle to the Ephesians.³⁶ In going to Ephesus, Tychicus might show this unsealed letter to the Ephesians, and we may suppose that the latter took one copy of it or transcribed its contents. The resemblance of this general epistle to the epistle to the Colossians might have resulted either from the fact of one man's writing several letters in an interval of a few days, and through preoccupation with a certain number of fixed ideas, unconsciously falling into the same expressions; or from the circumstance of Paul's directing Timothy³⁷ or Tychicus to compose the circular letter after the model of the epistle to the Colossians, but with the rejection of everything of a topical nature.³⁸ The passage (Colossians iv. 16) shows that Paul sometimes had his letters carried from one church to another. We shall soon remark that a like hypothesis must be made in order to explain certain particularities in the

epistle to the Romans. It appears that in the last years of his life, Paul adopted encyclical letters, as a form of writing very appropriate to the vast pastoral ministry which he had to fill. In writing to one church, the thought struck him that the things he was dictating would be suitable for other churches, and he took such measures as not to deprive them of them. We are thus led to regard the epistle to the Colossians and the so-called epistle to the Ephesians, in their *ensemble*, as a pendant to the epistle to the Romans ; as a sort of theological exposition, intended to be transmitted in the shape of a circular to the different churches established by the apostle. The epistle to the Ephesians had not that degree of authenticity possessed by the epistle to the Colossians ; but it had a more general turn, and received the preference. At a very early period, it was considered a work of Paul's, and a writing of high authority. This is proved by the usage made of it in the first epistle attributed to Peter,³⁹ a little work, not impossibly authentic, and which, at any rate, dates from the apostolic age. Among the letters bearing the name of Paul, the epistle to the Ephesians is perhaps the one which was most anciently quoted as a composition of the apostle of the Gentiles.⁴⁰ There remain the two epistles to Timothy and the epistle to Titus. The authenticity of these three epistles meets with insurmountable difficulties. I regard them as apocryphal compositions. To prove it, I could show that the language of these three writings is not Paul's. I could produce a series of terms and expressions, either exclusively peculiar or particularly dear to the author,⁴¹ and which, being characteristic, should occur in due proportion in the other epistles of Paul, but which fail to do so, at least in the desired ratio. Other expressions, which constitute to a certain degree the signature of Paul, are wanting. Above all, I could show that these epistles contain a large number of incongruities, either in regard to the supposed author, or in regard to the supposed intended recipients.⁴² The usual characteristic of letters fabricated with a doctrinal intention, is, that the fabricator

sees the public over the head of the pretended recipient that is to be, and writes to the latter things well known to him but which the fabricator is anxious to have impressed upon the public. The three epistles which we are discussing possess this character in a high degree.⁴³ Paul, whose authentic letters are so particular, so precise, — Paul, who, believing in an early destruction of the world, never supposes that he will be read in after ages, — Paul would here become a general preacher, so little occupied with his correspondent as to write him sermons not applicable to him, and to send him a petty code of ecclesiastical discipline in consideration of the future.⁴⁴ But these arguments, decisive of themselves, are not necessary. To prove my position, I shall only make use of arguments to some extent material; I shall undertake to demonstrate that there are no means of including these epistles within the known outline, or every possible outline, of the life of St. Paul.

There is one very important preliminary observation, namely, the perfect similitude of these three epistles to each other, — a similitude which obliges us to admit the whole three as authentic, or to reject the whole three as apocryphal. The particular characteristics which separate them so widely from the other epistles of St. Paul are the same. The expressions foreign to the language of St. Paul, which are met with, occur equally in the whole three. The defects which render the style unworthy of Paul are identical. It is something rather strange that every time St. Paul takes his pen to write to his disciples he should forget his customary manner, and fall into the same heaviness, the same idioms. The basis of the ideas gives rise to the same observation. The three epistles are filled with vague counsels, and moral exhortations, of which Timothy and Titus, familiarized by every-day intercourse with the ideas of the apostle, stood in no need. The errors here combated are always a species of gnosticism.⁴⁵ The preoccupation of the author in the three epistles never varies. We are conscious of the jealous and anxious guard over an orthodoxy already formed, — over a

hierarchy already developed. The three writings repeat themselves mutually at times,⁴³ and copy the other epistles of Paul.⁴¹ One thing is certain, and that is, if these three epistles were written under the dictation of Paul, they date from the same period of his life,⁴⁵ a period separated by long years from the time when he composed the other epistles. Every hypothesis which would strive to introduce between the three epistles in question an interval of three or four years for instance, or which would locate between them any one of the other epistles known to us, should be rejected. In order to explain the similitude of the three epistles to each other, and their unlikeness to the others, there is but one hypothesis possible; and that is, to suppose that they were written in rather a short space of time and a long while after the others, at a period in which all the circumstances that surrounded the apostle had changed, in which he had grown old, and his ideas and style become modified. Of course, should we succeed in establishing the possibility of such a hypothesis, this would not bring about the solution of the question. The style of a man may change; but not from the most striking and inimitable style that ever existed to a prolix and weak one.⁴⁹ However, such a hypothesis is formally excluded by our more certain knowledge of the life of Paul. We are going to prove it.

The first epistle to Timothy is the one which presents the fewest particular characteristics; and, nevertheless, were it the only one, we could not find a place for it in the life of St. Paul. Paul, when he is reputed to have written this epistle, had left Timothy a short time before, as he had not written to him since his departure (i, 3). The apostle left Timothy at Ephesus. Paul, at this moment, was setting out for Macedonia. Not having the time to combat the errors which were commencing in Ephesus, the leaders in which were Hymeneus and Alexander (i, 20), Paul left Timothy to war against these errors. The journey that Paul makes will be of short duration; he intends to return soon to Ephesus (iii. 14, 15; iv. 13).

Two hypotheses have been proposed to cause this epistle to enter into the contexture of Paul's, life such as it is given by the Acts, and confirmed by the unquestioned epistles. According to some, the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, which separated Paul from Timothy, is the one recounted in the Acts (xx. 1). This journey took place in the third mission. Paul remained three years at Ephesus. He sets out to revisit his churches in Macedonia, then those of Achaia. It is, they assert, from Macedonia or from Achaia that he writes to the disciple whom he left at Ephesus with full powers. This hypothesis is inadmissible. First of all, the Acts tell us (xix. 22) that Timothy had preceded his master into Macedonia, where, in reality, St. Paul rejoins him (2 Corinthians, i. 1). And then, is it likely that almost the day after his departure from Ephesus, Paul would have given his disciple the charges which we read in the first to Timothy? He himself might have combated the errors which he particularizes. The cast of the verse (1 Timothy, i. 3) in no wise becomes a man who left Ephesus after a long stay. Besides, Paul announces his intention of returning to Ephesus (iii. 14; iv. 13). Now Paul, in leaving Ephesus, had the definite intention of going to Jerusalem without returning to Ephesus (Acts xix. 21; xx. 1, 3, 16; 1 Corinthians xvi. 4; 2 Corinthians i. 16).⁵⁰ Let us add that if we consider the epistle written at this time, everything is awkward in it. The fault of the apocryphal letters, — which is, to state nothing precise, the author relating to his fictitious correspondent things with which the latter is acquainted, — this fault, I say, is here carried to a disgusting length.

To avoid this difficulty, and, above all, to explain the intention announced by Paul of returning to Ephesus, another plan is resorted to. It is urged that the journey to Macedonia, mentioned in the verse (1 Timothy i. 3) is a journey not related by the Acts, which Paul must have made during his three years' stay at Ephesus. Assuredly we are allowed to suppose that Paul was not sedentary all this time. It is, therefore, advanced

that he made a visit to the Archipelago, and thus they succeed in creating a link to join the epistle to Titus, in a manner more or less plausible, to the life of Paul. We do not deny the possibility of such a journey, although the silence of the Acts is certainly a difficulty; but we do deny that the trouble caused by the first epistle to Timothy is not thus gotten rid of. In this hypothesis, we understand still less than in the first the text of the verse, i. 3. Why tell Timothy what he knows very well? Paul has just passed one or two years at Ephesus; he will soon return there. What is the meaning of these errors, which he discovers at the very moment of his departure, and on account of which he leaves Timothy at Ephesus? In the said hypothesis, moreover, the first to Timothy must have been written about the same time as the great and authentic epistles of Paul. What! Paul write such a weak amplification the day after the epistle to the Galatians, and on the eve of the epistles to the Corinthians? He abandon his customary style, in leaving Ephesus, and regain it upon his return, in order to write the letters to the Corinthians, with the exception, a few years later, of resuming the style of the pretended journey, in order to write to the same Timothy? The second to Timothy, in the opinion of every one, could not have been written before the arrival of the captive Paul in Rome. Hence, there must have elapsed several years between the first to Timothy and the one to Titus, on the one side, and the second to Timothy on the other side. That cannot be. The three writings are copies of each other. How, then, can we suppose an interval of five or six years? Would Paul, writing to a friend, borrow from old letters? Is that a proceeding worthy of this master of epistolary art, so ardent, so rich in ideas? The second hypothesis, therefore, like the first, is a tissue of improbabilities. The verse (1 Timothy i. 3) is a circle from which the apologist cannot make his exit. This verse creates an impossibility in the biography of St. Paul. It would be necessary to find an episode in which Paul, on his way to

Macedonia, did no more than stop at Ephesus. This episode does not exist in the life of St. Paul before his captivity. Let us add, that when Paul is thought to have written the epistle in question, the church of Ephesus possessed a complete organization,—elders, deacons, and deaconesses.⁵¹ This church even offers the usual phenomena of an old community, schisms and errors.⁵² Nothing of this kind agrees with the times of the third mission.⁵³ If the first to Timothy is from Paul, we must attribute it to a hypothetical period of his life, subsequent to his captivity, and not comprised within the Acts. This hypothesis being the one towards which we are led by the examination of the two other epistles of which we have to speak, we postpone this examination to a later period.

The second epistle to Timothy presents many more facts than the first. The apostle is in prison, evidently in Rome (i. 8, 12, 16, 17; ii. 9, 10). Timothy is at Ephesus (i. 16, 18; ii. 17; iv. 14, 15, 19), where evil doctrines continue to multiply through the fault of Hymeneus and Philetus (ii. 17). Paul has not been long imprisoned in Rome, for he gives Timothy, as news, certain details of a circuit of the Archipelago that he has just made. At Miletum, he left Trophimus sick (iv. 20); at Troas, he left certain things with Carpus (iv. 13); Erastus remained at Corinth (iv. 20). At Rome, those of Asia, among others Phygellus and Hermogenes, abandoned him (i. 15). Another Ephesian, on the contrary, Onesiphorus, one of his old friends, having gone to Rome, searched for him, found him, and took care of him in his captivity (i. 16, 18). The apostle has a strong presentiment of his approaching end (iv. 6, 8). His disciples are far from him. Demas has forsaken him to attend to worldly interests; he has set out for Thessalonica (iv. 10). Crecent has gone to Galatia (*ibid.*); Titus to Dalmatia (*ibid.*); Paul has sent Tychicus to Ephesus (iv. 12); only Luke is with him (iv. 11). A certain Alexander, a coppersmith, of Ephesus, did him a great deal of evil, and opposed him strongly. This Alexander afterwards returned to Ephesus (iv. 14, 15). Paul

has already appeared before the Roman authorities. At this hearing, no one was present (iv. 16); but the Lord aided him, and delivered him out of the lion's mouth (iv. 17). Therefore he prays Timothy to come before winter (iv. 9, 21); and to bring Mark with him (iv. 11). He gives him a commission at the same time, namely, to bring him the book-box, the books, and the parchments which he left with Carpus, at Troas (iv. 13). He directs him to salute Prisca, Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus (iv. 19). He sends him greetings from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia, and from all the brethren (iv. 21).

This simple analysis suffices to reveal strange incoherencies. The apostle is in Rome; he has just made a tour of the Archipelago; he gives Timothy the news of it, as if he had not written to him since this journey. In the same letter, he speaks to him of his prison and his trial. Will you assert that this tour of the Archipelago is the journey of the captive Paul, recounted in Acts? But on that journey, Paul does not cross the Archipelago; he could neither go to Miletum nor to Troas, nor above all to Corinth, since off Cnidus the tempest drove the vessel on Crete, and afterward on Malta. Will it be said that the journey in question is the last journey of St. Paul as a free man, — his journey back to Jerusalem in company with the deputies? But Timothy was on this journey at least from Macedonia (Acts xx. 4). More than two years elapsed between this journey and the arrival of Paul at Rome (Acts xxiv. 27). Can it be conceived that Paul would relate to Timothy, as news, things which had happened in his presence so long ago, when in the mean time they had lived together and had just separated?⁵⁴ Far from remaining sick at Miletum, Trophimus followed the apostle to Jerusalem, and was the cause of his arrest (Acts xxi. 29). The passage (2 Timothy iv. 10, 11) compared to Colossians iv. 10, 14, and to Philemon 24, forms a contradiction no less grave. If Demas had left Paul when the latter wrote the second to Timothy, this epistle is subsequent to the epistle to the Colossians and to the epistle to Philemon. In writing these two

last epistles, Paul has Mark with him. How then, in writing the second to Timothy, can he say, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry"? On the other hand, as we have proved, it is not permitted to separate the three letters. Now, in whatever way the matter be arranged, there will always remain three years at least between the first and the second to Timothy, and we must place between them the second to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Romans. An only refuge remains, therefore, as with the first to Timothy; and that is, to suppose that the second to Timothy was written in a sequel to the life of the apostle, of which the Acts would make no mention. Were this hypothesis proved possible, yet a crowd of difficulties, inherent in the epistle, would still remain. Timothy would be at Ephesus, and (iv. 12) Paul would simply say, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus," as if Ephesus was not the home of the intended recipient. What could be more emotionless than the passage 2 Timothy iii. 10, 11 — yes, even more inexact? Paul did not join himself to Timothy until the second mission. Now, the persecutions that Paul underwent at Antioch of Pisidia, at Iconium, at Lystra, took place in the first.⁵⁵ The true Paul, in writing to Timothy, would have had many other mutual trials to recall to him. Let us add that he would not have lost his time in recalling them to him. A thousand improbabilities arise on all sides. But it is useless to discuss them; for the hypothesis in question, and according to which our epistle would be subsequent to the examination of Paul before the council of Nero, — this hypothesis, I say, is to be discarded, as we shall prove when we shall have introduced, in its turn, the epistle to Titus into the debate.

When Paul writes the epistle to Titus, the latter is in the isle of Crete (i. 5). Paul, who had just visited this island, and is very dissatisfied with the inhabitants (i. 12, 13), had left his disciples there to finish the establishment of the churches and to go from city to city and ordain *presbyteri* or *episcopi* (i. 5). He promises Titus to send Artemas and Tychicus to him soon.

He begs his disciple to come as soon as he shall have received these two brethren, and rejoin him at Nicopolis, where he intends to winter (iii. 12). The apostle then charges his disciple to conduct Zenas and Apollos on their journey honorably, and to take great care of them (iii. 13).

Here again, difficulties present themselves with each phrase. Not a word for the faithful Cretans ; nothing but a hurtful and unbecoming severity (i. 12, 13) ; new declamations against errors, the existence of which in churches recently established cannot be comprehended (i. 10, *et seq.*) ; errors which Paul absent sees and understands better than Titus, who is on the spot ; details which would infer that Christianity was already old and completely developed in the island (i. 5, 6) ; trivial recommendations concerning points most clear. Such an epistle would have been very useless to Titus ; not a word of anything which he did not know by heart. But it is not by plausible demonstrations, but by direct arguments, that the apocryphal character of the document in question can be shown.

If we seek to attach this letter to that period of Paul's life comprehended within the Acts, we experience the same difficulties as with the preceding ones. According to the Acts, Paul lands in Crete but once, and that is in his shipwreck. He only made a short sojourn there ; during this sojourn, he was a captive. Assuredly, it was not at this moment that Paul was able to begin the establishment of churches in the island. Besides, if it were to the journey of Paul, a captive, that Titus (i. 5) relates, Paul, when writing, would be a prisoner in Rome. How can he write from his prison in Rome that he has the intention of going to pass the winter at Nicopolis ? Why does he not, according to his custom, make some allusion to his condition as captive ? Another hypothesis has been attempted. They have undertaken to join the epistle to Titus and the first to Timothy together. It has been supposed that these two epistles were the fruit of the episodal journey that St. Paul must have made during his stay at Ephesus. Although this hypothesis does not

go far towards explaining the difficulties of the first to Timothy, let us take it up in order, to see if the epistle to Titus gives it any support. Paul has been at Ephesus for a year or two. During the summer, he forms the project of an apostolic tour, of which the Acts have made no mention. He leaves Timothy at Ephesus, and takes with him Titus and the two Ephesians, Artemas and Tychicus. He goes at first to Macedonia, then from there to Crete, where he establishes a few churches. He leaves Titus in the island, charging him to continue his work, and goes to Corinth with Artemas and Tychicus. There he makes the acquaintance of Apollos, whom he had not yet seen, and who was upon the point of setting out for Ephesus. He begs Apollos to turn aside a little from his road, in order to go to Crete and carry Titus the epistle which has been handed down to us. His plan is now to go to Epirus, and pass the winter at Nicopolis. He writes this plan to Titus, tells him that he will send Artemas and Tychicus to him in Crete, and requests him, so soon as he shall have seen them, to come and rejoin him at Nicopolis. Paul then makes his journey to Epirus. He writes from Epirus, the first to Timothy, and commissions Artemas and Tychicus to carry it. He enjoins upon them, nevertheless, to go by way of Crete, in order at the same time to give word to Titus to come and rejoin him at Nicopolis. Titus goes to Nicopolis ; the apostle and his disciple return together to Ephesus.

With this hypothesis, we account for, in an indifferent manner, the circumstances of the epistle to Titus, and of the first to Timothy. Even more : we obtain two apparent advantages. It seems to explain the passages of the epistles to the Corinthians, from which, at first glance, it would appear to follow that Paul, going to Corinth at the end of his long stay at Ephesus, went there for the third time (1 Corinthians, xxi. 7 ; 2 Corinthians, ii. 1 ; xii. 14, 21 ; xiii. 1). It is also thought that it explains the passage in which St. Paul pretends to have preached the Gospel as far as Illyria (Romans xv. 19). The advantages possess nothing

substantial,⁵⁶ and yet how many wounds probability receives in order to obtain them. First of all, this pretended episodical journey, so short that the author of the Acts did not deem it worth while to speak of it, must have been quite considerable, since it included a journey to Macedonia, a journey to Crete, a sojourn at Corinth, and a wintering at Nicopolis. That would make almost a year. How then can the author of the Acts say that the sojourn of Paul at Ephesus lasted for three years (Acts xix. 8, 10; xx. 31)?⁵⁷ These expressions, without doubt, would not exclude short absences, but they exclude a series of journeys. Moreover, in the hypothesis under discussion, the journey to Nicopolis would have taken place before the second epistle to the Corinthians.⁵⁸ Now, in that epistle, Paul declares that Corinth is, at the time he is writing, the extreme western point of his missions.⁵⁹ Finally, the itinerary traced of Paul's journey is not at all natural. Paul goes first to Macedonia,—the text is formal (1 Timothy i. 3), and from there he goes to Crete. To go from Macedonia to Crete, Paul would have been obliged to take a coasting vessel either for Ephesus, in which case the verse (1 Timothy i. 3) is devoid of sense; or for Corinth, in which case we cannot conceive why he should be obliged to return thither immediately after. And why should Paul, wishing to journey to Epirus, speak of the wintering that is to terminate it, and not of the voyage itself? And how is it that we know nothing more about this sojourn at Nicopolis? To suppose that Nicopolis in Thrace, on the Nessus, is meant, would only serve to increase the difficulty, and would have none of the advantages of the hypothesis above set forth. Some exegetes think to overcome the difficulty by slightly modifying the itinerary exacted by this hypothesis. According to them, Paul went from Ephesus to Crete, from there to Corinth, then to Nicopolis, then to Macedonia. The fatal verse (1 Timothy i. 3) prevents this. Let us suppose a person setting out from Paris, with the intention of making a tour in England, on the borders of the Rhine, in Switzerland, and in Lombardy. Would this person, having

arrived at Cologne, write to one of his friends in Paris, "I left you in Paris, upon setting out for Lombardy"? The conduct of St. Paul, in all these suppositions, is not less absurd than his itinerary. The journey of Tychicus and Artemas to Crete is not justified. Why did not Paul give Apollos a letter for Timothy?⁶⁹ Why did he refrain from writing, until doing so through Tychicus and Artemas? Why did he not then appoint the time when Titus was to rejoin him, since his plans were so definite? These journeys all taking place by way of Crete, to suit the apologetic requirements, are very unnatural. Paul, in this hypothesis of the episodical journey, in whatever way they arrange the itinerary, gives and retains continually; he performs acts which he does not follow up; he only partially profits by the results of his actions, keeping for future occasions what he might very well do on the spot. When these epistles are in question, it seems as if the ordinary laws of probability and good sense are reversed. All efforts to cause the epistles to Titus and Timothy to assume a place within the outlines of the life of St. Paul, as traced in the Acts, are therefore tainted with inexplicable contradictions. The authentic epistles of St. Paul explain themselves, take each other for granted, penetrate one into the other; while the three epistles in question would form a little circle of themselves, cut by a punch; and it would be so much the more singular that two of them, the first to Timothy and the one to Titus, should fall exactly in the midst of this vortex of so well connected and well known affairs, to which the epistle to the Galatians, the two to the Corinthians, and the one to the Romans relate. But several of the exegetes who defend the authenticity of these three epistles have recourse to another hypothesis. They pretend that these epistles should be placed in a period of the apostle's life passed over in silence by the Acts. According to them, Paul, after the hearing before Nero, as the Acts take for granted, was acquitted, which is very possible, even probable. Returned to liberty, he resumes his apostolic wanderings, and goes to Spain, which is also probable.

According to the critics we are now speaking of, Paul, at this period of his life, made a new voyage in the Archipelago,—a voyage to which the first epistle to Timothy and the epistle to Titus would belong. He would return again to Rome: there he would be a prisoner for the second time, and from his prison he would write the second to Timothy.

All this, it must be confessed, resembles an artificial system of defence on the part of a criminal, who, in order to meet objections, is forced to imagine an *ensemble* of facts which have no connection with anything known. These isolated hypotheses, defenceless and disconnected with all precedents, are, in the law, the sign of guilt; in criticism, the sign of the apocryphal. Even allowing the possibility of this new voyage in the Archipelago, we would still have infinite trouble in making the circumstances of the three epistles agree. The comings and goings would be very slightly accounted for. But such a discussion is useless. It is evident, in fact, that the author of the second to Timothy means to speak of the captivity mentioned by the Acts, and to which the epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon have reference. The close connection of the 2 Timothy iv. 9, 22, with the endings of the epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, proves it. Those who surround the apostle are almost identical in both cases. The captivity, from the midst of which Paul is thought to have written the second to Timothy, will terminate in his liberation (2 Timothy iv. 17, 18). Paul, in this epistle, is full of hope. He is meditating new plans, and is preoccupied, in fact, with the absorbing thought, during his first (and only) captivity, of finishing the evangelical preaching; preaching Christ to all nations, and, in particular, to the people of the extreme occident.⁶¹ If the three epistles in question were of so advanced a date, we should not be able to conceive how Timothy could always be treated like a young man in them. We can, in addition, prove directly that this voyage in the Archipelago, subsequent to Paul's sojourn in Rome, did not take place. In such a voyage, surely St. Paul would have

touched at Miletum (2 Timothy iv. 20). Now, in the beautiful discourse which the author of the Acts assigns to Paul when arriving at Miletus, at the end of his third mission, this author makes Paul say, "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdom of God, shall see my face no more."⁶² And let it not be said that St. Paul might have deceived himself in his foresight, changed his mind,⁶³ and revisited a church to which he thought he had bidden adieu for ever. That is not the question. It matters very little to us whether St. Paul ever pronounced these words or not. The author of Acts knew well the continuation of the life of Paul, although unfortunately he has not deemed it proper to inform us of it. It is impossible that he should have put a prediction in his master's mouth which he well knew would not be verified.

The letters to Timothy and Titus are therefore rejected by the entire contexture of the biography of Paul. When we force them into it by any one of their parts, they escape from it by another. Even by creating a period in the apostle's life expressly for them, we obtain nothing satisfactory. These epistles reject each other themselves. They are full of contradictions.⁶⁴ Were the Acts and the authentic epistles lost, we would not succeed in creating a hypothesis to hold upright the three writings in question. And let it not be said that a forger would not have thrown himself with a joyful heart into these contradictions. Denis of Corinth, in the second century, has not a less stranger theory of the voyages of St. Paul, since he makes him go to Corinth, and set out from Corinth for Rome in company with St. Peter,⁶⁵ a thing entirely impossible. Without a doubt, the three epistles in question were fabricated at a period in which the Acts did not yet possess full authority. Later, the canvas of the Acts was retouched; as, for instance, at the hands of the author of the fable of Thecla, toward the year 200. The author of our epistles knows the names of the principal disciples of Paul; he has read several of his epistles;⁶⁶ he has a vague idea of his voyages; his mind is fixed in quite a correct manner

upon this swarm of disciples who surrounded Paul, and whom he was starting off as couriers in all directions.⁶⁷ But the details he imagines are false and inconsistent. He always considers Timothy as a young man. The incomplete idea which he has of a journey of Paul to Crete leads him to believe that the apostle has established churches there. The persons whom he introduces in the three epistles are above all Ephesian. We are tempted at moments to believe that the desire of exalting certain families of Ephesus, and of lowering others, was not entirely absent from the fabricator's mind.⁶⁸ Are the three epistles in question apocryphal from one end to another, or did they make use of authentic notes addressed to Titus and Timothy in composing them, — notes which they may have altered to suit the ideas of the day, with the intention of lending a show of apostolic authority to the development that the ecclesiastic hierarchy was manifesting? It is a matter difficult to decide. Perhaps in certain parts, at the end of the second to Timothy, for instance, notes of different dates were mingled; but even then we must admit that the fabricator gave his fancy full latitude. In fact, one consequence which results from this proceeding is, that the three epistles are sisters; that they compose, in truth, only one work; and that there is no distinction between them, arising from respective claims to authenticity.

It is entirely a different question to determine whether any of the statements of the second to Timothy (i. 15, 18; ii. 17, 18; iv. 9, 21), for instance, have not a historical value. The fabricator, though not well acquainted with the life of Paul, and not having the Acts,⁶⁹ might have been in possession of original details, especially concerning the last years of the apostle. In particular, we believe that the passage of the second to Timothy (iv. 9, 21) is very important, and throws a true light on the captivity of Paul in Rome. The fourth gospel is also, in its way, an apocryphal work; but we cannot, on that account, say that it is a work without historical value. As to the oddness of our opinions in these suppositions concerning works, that must in no

wise trouble us. That did not raise any scruples.⁷² If the pious author of the false letters to Timothy and Titus could return, and be present at the discussions of which he is the cause among us, he would not defend himself. He would reply, like the priest of Asia, author of the fiction of Thecla, when he saw himself driven to extremes, "*Convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse.*"⁷¹ The time of the composition of these three epistles may be located towards the year 90 or 100. Theophilus of Antioch (towards the year 170) quotes them in direct terms.⁷² Irenæus,⁷³ Clement of Alexandria,⁷⁴ and Tertullian,⁷⁵ also admit them. Marcion, on the contrary, either rejects them or has no knowledge of them.⁷⁶ The allusions, supposed to exist in the epistles attributed to Clement of Rome,⁷⁷ Ignatius,⁷⁸ and Polycarp,⁷⁹ are doubtful. There were in the atmosphere of this period a certain number of homiletic phrases quite complete. The presence of these phrases in a writing does not prove that the author borrowed them directly from such other writing which may contain them. The agreement which we remark between certain expressions of Hegesippus⁸⁰ and certain passages in the epistles in question is singular. We know not what inference to draw from it; for if, in these expressions, Hegesippus has the first epistle to Timothy in view, it would seem as if he regarded it as a writing subsequent to the death of the apostles. However it may be, it is clear that when they made the collection of Paul's letters, those addressed to Titus and Timothy possessed full authority. Where were they composed? Perhaps at Ephesus,⁸¹ perhaps at Rome. Those in favor of the second hypothesis might say that the errors found in them would not have been made in the east. The style contains Latinisms.⁸² The motive that gave rise to the writing, namely, the desire of increasing the force of the hierarchical principle and authority of the church, by presenting a model of piety, docility, "ecclesiastic spirit," traced out by the apostle himself, is entirely in harmony with our knowledge of the character of the Roman church from the first century.

It remains for us to speak of the epistle to the Hebrews. As we have already asserted, this epistle would not be from Paul, had it not been classed in the same category with the two epistles to Timothy and the epistle to Titus, for the author does not seek to pass his work off for a writing of the apostle Paul's. What is the value of the opinion which has established itself in the church, and according to which Paul would be the author of the said epistle? The study of the manuscripts, the examination of ecclesiastical tradition, and the intrinsic criticism of the piece itself, are going to enlighten us upon this subject.

The old manuscripts have simply at the head of the epistle *Πρὸς Ἑβραίους*. As to the order of transcription, the *Codex Vaticanus* and the *Codex Sinaiticus*, representing the Alexandrine tradition, place the epistle among those of Paul. The Greco-Latin manuscripts, on the other hand, manifest all the hesitations prevalent in the west during the first half of the middle age concerning the canonicity of the epistle to the Hebrews, and consequently its being attributed to Paul. The *Codex Boernerianus* omits it; the *Codex Augiensis* only gives it in Latin, at the conclusion of the epistles of Paul. The *Codex Claromontanus* gives the epistle in question no rank at all, like a sort of appendix after the general stichometry of the Scripture,⁸³ a proof that the epistle did not exist in the manuscript from which the *Claromontanus* was transcribed. In the above-mentioned stichometry (a very old writing), the epistle to the Hebrews does not figure at all; or, if it does, it is under the name of Barnabas.⁸⁴ Finally, the errors which crowd the Latin text of the epistle in *Claromontanus* would be sufficient to awaken the suspicion of the critic, and to prove that this epistle only entered into the canon of the Latin church slowly and unawares.⁸⁵ The same uncertainty exists in the tradition. Marcion had not the epistle to the Hebrews in his collection of the epistles of Paul.⁸⁶ The author of the so-called canon of Muratori omits it in his list. Irenæus is acquainted with the writing in question, but does not consider it from Paul.⁸⁷ Clement of Alexandria⁸⁸ believes

it to be from Paul; but he is conscious of the difficulty in attributing it to him, and has recourse to a not very acceptable hypothesis, in order to clear himself: he supposes that Paul wrote the epistle in Hebrew, and that Luke translated it into Greek. Origen, in one sense, likewise admits the epistle to the Hebrews as being from Paul, but he acknowledges that many persons deny that it was written by the latter. He does not recognize Paul's style in it, and supposes somewhat in the same way as Clement of Alexandria, that the basis of the ideas alone belongs to the apostle. "The character of the style of the epistle entitled, 'To the Hebrews,'" he remarks, "has not the rusticity of the apostle's. . . . This letter is, in respect to the arrangement of the words, much more Hellenic, as any one would acknowledge who is capable of judging of the difference of the styles. . . . As for me, if I were to express an opinion, I would say that the thoughts are the apostle's, but that the style and arrangement of the words indicate that the sayings of the apostle were reported *memoriter* by some one, who also committed the discourses of his master to writing. If, then, any church considers this epistle from Paul, we have only to approve it; for it cannot be that the elders had no reason in transmitting it as a writing of Paul's. As to the question of knowing who wrote this epistle, God knows the truth. Among the opinions transmitted us by history, one holds that it was written by Clement, who was bishop of the Romans; another, by Luke, who wrote the Gospels and the Acts."⁸⁹ Tertullian does not observe so many considerations; he presents the epistle to the Hebrews, frankly, as the work of Barnabas.⁹⁰ Caius, priest of Rome,⁹¹ St. Hypolitus,⁹² and St. Cyprian,⁹³ did not place it among the epistles of Paul. In the dispute concerning Novatianism, in which there were several reasons for making use of this epistle, we find no mention of it.

It was at Alexandria where was found that centre of opinion which wished to intercalate the epistle to the Hebrews into the series of Paul's letters. Toward the middle of the third

century, Dionysius of Alexandria⁹⁴ did not seem to doubt that Paul was the author of it. From this period on, it is the most general opinion in the East.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, objections do not cease to be heard.⁹⁶ Above all, are they energetic among the Latins,⁹⁷ the Roman Church in particular maintaining that the epistle is not from Paul.⁹⁸ Eusebius hesitates a great deal, and returns to the hypotheses of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. He inclines to the belief that the epistle was composed in Hebrew by Paul and translated by Clement. The Romans,⁹⁹ St. Jerome¹⁰⁰ and St. Augustine,¹⁰¹ have difficulty in silencing their doubts, and seldom quote this portion of the canon without reservation. Divers documents always persist in naming Luke, Barnabas, or Clement, as author of the work.¹⁰² The old manuscripts of Latin origin would suffice, as we have seen, to testify to the repugnance that the West experienced when this epistle was presented to it as one of Paul's works. It is clear, therefore, that when they made the *editio princeps*, if the expression be allowed, of Paul's letters, their number was fixed at thirteen. They became accustomed at an early day, no doubt, to place the epistle to the Hebrews at the end of these thirteen letters, as an anonymous apostolic writing, which resembled in certain respects to ideas the writings of Paul. After this, there was but one step to take in order to attain the impression that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by the apostle. Everything leads us to believe that this inference was drawn at Alexandria; that is to say, in a church relatively modern when compared to the churches of Syria, Asia, Greece, and Rome. Such an inference can have no value in a critical examination, if good intrinsic proofs prevent the attributing of the epistle in question to the apostle Paul.

Now, such is in reality the case. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, good judges in regard to Greek style, do not discover the characteristics of St. Paul's style in this epistle. St. Jerome has the same opinion. The Fathers of the Latin Church, who are unwilling to accept it as an epistle of Paul's, give the reason

of their action, *propter styli sermonisque distantiam*.¹⁰³ This reason is excellent. The style of the epistle to the Hebrews is, in truth, different from that of Paul. It is more oratorical, fuller, the language presents particular words. The basis of the thoughts is not unlike the opinions of Paul, especially of the captive Paul; but the exposition and exegesis are entirely different. No personal superscription, contrary to the constant usage of the apostle. Characteristics, always expected to be met with in an epistle from Paul, are wanting in this. The exegesis is above all allegorical, and resembles that of Philo much more than Paul's. The author betrays Alexandrine culture; he only makes use of the so-called version of the Septuagint; his reasoning concerning the text of this version shows a complete ignorance of Hebrew;¹⁰⁴ his manner of quoting and analyzing biblical texts is not conformable to Paul's method. The author, on another side, is a Jew; he thinks to exalt the Messiah by comparing him to the Jewish high priest; Christianity is for him only a sort of Judaism fulfilled; he is far from regarding the law as abolished. The passage (ii. 3) in which the author ranks himself among those who have only known the mysteries of the life of Christ indirectly from the lips of Jesus' disciples, in no wise corresponds to one of Paul's most decided declarations. Finally, let us add that in writing to Jewish-Christians, Paul would have neglected his most inflexible resolution, which was, never to perform a pastoral act upon the territory of the Jewish-Christian churches, so that the apostles of circumcision should not, on their side, encroach upon the churches of the uncircumcised.¹⁰⁵

The epistle to the Hebrews is, therefore, not from Paul. From whom is it? Where was it written? To whom was it addressed? We shall examine all these points in our fourth volume. For the present, the date alone of so important a writing interests us. Now, this date can be determined with considerable precision. The epistle to the Hebrews is, according to all probabilities, subsequent to the year 70, since the Levitical

service of the temple is represented in it as continuing regularly and without interruption.¹⁰⁶ From another side, the passages xiii. 7, and even v. 12, appear to contain an allusion to the death of the apostles at Jerusalem, — James, brother of the Lord, for instance. The passage xiii. 13, seems to relate to a deliverance of Timothy, subsequent to the death of Paul.¹⁰⁷ The passages v. 12, and following, and perhaps xiii. 7, are, I believe, a distinct mention of the persecution of Nero in the year 64.¹⁰⁸ It is probable that the passage iii. 7, and following, contain an allusion to the beginning of the revolt of Judea (year 66) and a presentiment of the evils which are going to ensue. This passage also implies that the year 40, since the death of Jesus, had not elapsed, and that this term was drawing near. So everything goes toward making us suppose that the committing to writing of the epistle to the Hebrews took place in 65–70, probably in the year 66.¹⁰⁹

After having discussed the authenticity, we have now to discuss the soundness of the epistles of Paul. The authentic epistles were never interpolated.¹¹⁰ The style of the apostle is so peculiarly his own, so original, that any addition would stand out upon the ground of the text by its lack of color. In the labor of editing, however, which took place when the epistles were collected, several processes were gone through with, of which we must take note. The method of the editors seems to have been: First, to add nothing to the text; Second, to lose nothing of what they thought had been dictated or written by the apostle; Third, to avoid the repetitions which could not fail to occur, especially in the case of circular letters, with corresponding parts. The editors, in such a case, appear to have followed a system of piecing or intercalation, the design of which seems to have been to save writings which otherwise would have perished. Thus the passage 2 Corinthians vi. 14, vii. 1, forms a short paragraph, which so singularly severs the continuation of the epistle that we are led to believe that it was rudely sewed on there. The last chapters of the epistle to

the Romans present facts still more striking, and which it is necessary to discuss minutely ; for many of the portions of Paul's biography depend upon the system adopted in these chapters.

In reading the epistle to the Romans, we experience some astonishment upon reaching the twelfth chapter. There, Paul appears to depart from his customary rule, "Every one on his own ground." It is strange that he should give imperative counsels to a church which he did not establish, he who is so quick to animadvert upon the impertinence of those who strive to build upon foundations laid by others.¹¹¹ At the end of the fourteenth chapter, still stranger particularities are found. Several manuscripts, which Griesbach follows, after the example of John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius,¹¹² contain at this place the ending of chapter xvi. (verses 25, 27). The *Codex Alexandrinus*, and several others, repeat this ending twice : once at the end of the fourteenth chapter, and again at the end of the sixteenth chapter.

The verses 1-13 of chapter xv. excite our surprise again. These verses tamely repeat and resume what precedes. It is hardly to be imagined that they occurred in the same letter with what precedes them. Paul often repeats himself in the course of the same exposition, but he never returns to an argument to resume it and weaken it. Let us add that the verses 1-13 appear to be addressed to Jewish-Christians. St. Paul here makes concessions to Jewish ideas.¹¹³ What could be more singular than this 8th verse, in which Christ is called *διάκονος περιτομῆς*? It would seem that this is a *resumé* of chapters xii., xiii., and xiv., for the use of Jewish-Christian readers, to whom Paul is anxious to prove, by texts, that the adoption of the Gentiles does not exclude the right from Israel, and that Christ fulfilled the ancient promises.¹¹⁴

The portion of chapter xv., from 14-33, inclusive, is evidently addressed to the Church of Rome, and to that church alone. Here Paul expresses himself with a reserve, as is proper in writing to a church which he has not seen, and which, being

mostly Judo-Christian, is not directly under his jurisdiction. In chapters xii., xiii., and xiv., the tone of the letter is firmer; the apostle now speaks with a mild authority; he makes use of the verb *παρακαλῶ*, a verb of a very subdued tinge without a doubt, but which is always the word that he makes use of when speaking to his disciples.¹¹⁵

The verse 33 is a complete conclusion to the epistle to the Romans, according to St. Paul's rules on ending. The verses 1 and 2 of the chapter xvi. might still be admitted as a *post-scriptum* to the epistle to the Romans; but what follows the 3d verse gives rise to real difficulties. Paul, as if he had not closed his letter with the word *amen*, sets about saluting twenty-six persons, without mentioning the five churches or groups. In the first place, Paul never puts salutations after the benediction and the *amen*, in this manner. Besides, these are not ordinary salutations, such as one might address to those whom he has not seen. Paul has evidently had the most intimate connections with the persons whom he salutes. Each of them *has his particular characteristic. This one has worked with him; these were in prison with him; another has been a mother to him (doubtlessly taking care of him in some sickness).¹¹⁶ He knows at what time each one was converted; all are his friends, his coadjutors, his beloved. It is not natural that he should have such relations with a church in which he has never been, which is not of his school, with a Jewish-Christian church in which his principles forbid him to labor. Not only does he know by name all the Christians of the church to which he is writing, but he even knows the masters of those who are slaves, Aristobulus and Narcissus. How can he designate with so much confidence these two households, if they are at Rome, where he has never been? Writing to churches which he has established, Paul salutes two or three persons. Why does he salute so large a number of brethren and sisters in a church which he has never visited? If we examine in detail the persons whom he salutes, we shall see with still more evidence that this page of

salutations was never addressed to the Church of Rome. We do not find in it any of those whom we know to have belonged to the Church of Rome ;¹¹⁷ and we do find several persons who assuredly never were of that number. First of all (v. 3-4) come Aquila and Priscilla. All acknowledge that only a few months elapsed between the writing of the first epistle to the Corinthians and the writing of the epistle to the Romans. Now, when St. Paul wrote the first to the Corinthians, Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus.¹¹⁸ In the mean time, this apostolic couple, it is urged, might have set out for Rome. That would be very singular. Aquila and Priscilla had left Rome once, driven out by an edict. We find them afterward in Corinth, then in Ephesus. To lead them back to Rome, without having their sentence of banishment repealed, on the very day after that on which Paul has bidden them adieu at Ephesus, would be assigning them a too nomadic life, and heaping up improbabilities. Let us add, that the author of the second apocryphal epistle of Paul to Timothy supposes Aquila and Priscilla to be at Ephesus,¹¹⁹ which proves that tradition located them there. The petty Roman martyrology (source of the subsequent reductions) makes the following entry on the 8th of July : *In Asia Minori, Aquilæ et Priscillæ uxoris ejus.*¹²⁰ This is not all. In the 5th verse of chapter v., Paul salutes Epenetus as “the first fruits of Asia unto Christ.” What ! had the whole of the Church of Ephesus agreed to meet at Rome ? The list of names which follows likewise agrees better with Ephesus than Rome.¹²¹ Without doubt, the first Church of Rome was chiefly Grecian in language. In the world of slaves and freedmen, from which Christianity was recruiting itself, Greek names even at Rome were common.¹²² Nevertheless, in examining the Jewish inscriptions of Rome, P. Garrucci found that the number of Latin proper names was double that of the Greek names.¹²³ Now here, out of twenty-four names, there are sixteen Greek, seven Latin, one Hebrew, so that there are more than twice as many Greek as Latin names. The names of the heads of

households, Aristobulus and Narcissus, are also Greek. The 3-16th verses of chapter xvi., Romans, were not therefore addressed to the Church of Rome, they were addressed to the Church of Ephesus. Nor could the 17-20th verses have been addressed to the Romans. St. Paul here resumes his customary word when he gives an order to his disciples (*παρακαλῶ*): he expresses himself with extreme sharpness in regard to the divisions caused by his adversaries. We feel that he is here at home; he knows the state of the church he is addressing; he takes pride in it, like a master in his pupils (*ἐφ' ὑμῖν χαίρω*). These verses have no meaning, if we suppose them addressed by the apostle to a church which would have been unknown to him; each word proves that he had preached to those to whom he was writing, and that they were enticed by his enemies. These verses could only have been addressed to the Corinthians or to the Ephesians. The epistle at the end of which they are found was written from Corinth; these verses, which constitute the ending of a letter, were therefore addressed to the Ephesians. As we have shown that the verses 3-16 were also addressed to the faithful of Ephesus, we thus obtain a long fragment (xvi. 3-20) which was to have formed part of a letter to the Ephesians. Then it becomes more natural to attach to the 3-20th verses the 1-2d verses of the same chapter, — verses which may be considered as a *post-scriptum* after the *amen*, but which it is better to refer to what follows. The journey of Phebe thus assumes a greater show of probability. Finally, the rather imperative recommendations of the 2d verse, chapter xvi., and the motive with which Paul urges them, are better understood addressed to the Ephesians, who were under so many obligations to the apostle, than when addressed to the Romans, who owed him nothing.

The 21-24th verses of the sixteenth chapter,¹²¹ are not qualified, any more than what precedes, to constitute a part of an epistle to the Romans. Why should all these persons, who had never been at Rome, who were not known to the faithful of

Rome, salute the latter? Who could tell the Church of Rome the names of these unknown ones? One very important observation is, that they are names of Macedonians, or of people who might know the churches of Macedonia. The 24th verse is an ending to a letter. The 21-24th verses, therefore, may be the end of a letter addressed to the Thessalonians.

The 25-27th verses offer us a new ending, which has nothing topical, and which, as already stated, occurs in several manuscripts at the end of the fourteenth chapter.

In other manuscripts, particularly in the *Boernerianus* and *Augiensis* (Greek portion), this ending is wanting.¹²⁵ Assuredly this piece did not belong to the epistle to the Romans, terminating at the 33d verse, chapter xv., nor to the epistle to the Ephesians, terminating at the 20th verse, chapter xvi., nor to the epistle to the churches of Macedonia, which terminates at the 24th verse, chapter xvi. We arrive, then, at this strange conclusion, that the epistle ends four times, and in the *Codex Alexandrinus* five times. This is absolutely contrary to the custom of Paul, and even to good sense. We have here, then, a difficulty arising from some particular accident. Must we, like Marcion¹²³ and Bauer, pronounce the last two chapters of the epistle to the Romans apocryphal? It is surprising that so skilful a critic as Bauer should be satisfied with such an uncouth solution. Why would a fabricator have invented such insignificant details? Why would he have added a list of proper names to a sacred work? In the first and second centuries, the authors of apocryphal works had, almost without exception, a dogmatic interest. They interpolated the apostolic writings, with a view of establishing a doctrine or discipline. We deem ourselves able to propose a more satisfactory hypothesis than Bauer. According to our opinion, the so-called epistle to the Romans, in the first place, was not addressed in its entirety to the Romans, and, in the second place, was not addressed to the Romans alone.

St. Paul, in advancing in his career, acquired a taste for en-

cyclical epistles,¹²⁷ destined to be read in several churches.¹²⁸ We are of the opinion that the body of the epistle to the Romans was an encyclical of this sort. St. Paul, at the period of his full maturity, addresses it to his most important churches, — at least to three of them, — and by exception, he addresses it to the church of Rome. The four endings, occurring in verses xv. 33, xvi. 40, xvi. 24, and xvi. 27, are the endings of the different copies sent. When they edited the epistles, the one addressed to the church of Rome was taken as a basis;¹²⁹ but in order to lose nothing, they placed, in continuation of the text thus arranged, the varying portions, and especially the divers endings of the abandoned copies.¹³⁰ This explains the existence of so many singularities. First: The double service performed by the passage, xv. 1-13, with the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters, which, although unsuitable for the Romans are suitable for the churches founded by the apostle; while the passage, xv. 1-13, cannot be addressed to the disciples of Paul, and, on the contrary, can be to the Romans. Second: Certain characteristics of the epistle which but slightly adapt themselves to the faithful of Rome, and would even border upon indiscretion were they solely addressed to the latter.¹³¹ Third: The hesitation of the best critics in regard to the question of knowing whether the epistle was addressed to the converted heathen or to Jewish Christians.¹³² A very simple matter, according to our hypothesis; for then the principal portions would have been composed for several churches at once. Fourth: It being a surprising fact that Paul should compose so important a writing solely in consideration of a church which was unknown to him, and over which he had very questionable privileges. Fifth: Finally, the strange peculiarities of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters; these salutations in the wrong way; these four endings, three of which did not certainly exist in the copy sent to Rome. It will be seen in the progress of the present volume how well this hypothesis accords with all the other necessities of Paul's life.

Let us not omit the testimony of an important manuscript. The *Codex Boernerianus* has not the mention of Rome in the 7-15th verses of the first chapter.¹³³ It would be impossible to say that this is an omission made in consideration of their being read in the churches. The Boernerian manuscript, a work of the philologers of St. Gall, about the year 900, declares its design to be purely exegetical, and was copied from a very old manuscript. The notes will suffice to explain to the reader the nature of the other documents which I have employed, and the usage I have put them to. I do not believe that I have neglected any means of information or verification. I have visited all the countries mentioned in this volume, excepting Galatia. In the Talmudic portion, I have had the learned co-operation of Mr. Joseph Derenbourg and of Mr. Neubauer. In geographical questions, I have conferred with Messrs. Perrot, Heuzey, and Ernst Desjardius, upon all difficult points. In the Greek and Latin portions, especially in inscriptions, three colleagues, Messrs. Léon Renier, Egger, and Waddington, whose friendship I value most highly, have permitted me to have recourse, at all times, to their fine critical judgment and profound erudition. Mr. Waddington, in particular, knows Syria and Asia so perfectly, that, in questions relating to these countries, I never feel my conscience at rest until I have succeeded in adjusting my views to those of this wise and judicious explorer.

I have regretted not being able to give place in this book to an account of the last part of St. Paul's life ; but it would have been necessary to enlarge this volume exceedingly. And further, the third book would have thus lost something of the historical solidity which characterizes it. In truth, from the arrival of Paul at Rome, we cease to stand upon the ground of unquestioned texts, — we begin to struggle in the darkness of legends and apocryphal documents. The next volume (fourth book of the history of the origins of Christianity) will present the end of Paul's life, the events of Judea, the going of Peter to Rome (I consider it probable), the persecution of Nero, the death of the

apostles, the Apocalypse, the taking of Jerusalem, and the editing of the Synoptical Gospels. Then a fifth and last volume will comprehend the editing of the less ancient writings of the New Testament, the interior movements of the Church of Asia Minor, the progress of the hierarchy and discipline, the birth of the gnostic sects, the definitive constitution of a dogmatic orthodoxy and of the episcopate. When once the last writing of the New Testament shall be edited ; when once the authority of the Church shall be established and armed with a sort of touchstone, in order to tell error from truth ; when once the petty democratic brotherhoods of the early apostolic age shall have resigned their powers into the hands of the bishop, then Christianity will be complete. The child will still grow ; but he has all his limbs : it is no longer an embryo ; he is in possession of all his essential organs. About the same time, however, the last ties which bound the Christian Church to its mother, the Jewish synagogue, are cut : the church exists as an independent being, and has no longer aught for a mother excepting hatred. The history of the origins of Christianity ends here. I trust that I shall be able, before five years, to finish this work for which I have desired to reserve the ripest years of my life. It will have cost me many a sacrifice ; above all, in excluding me from teaching in the College of France, the second plan which I had laid out. But we must not be too exacting ; perhaps he to whom out of two projects it has been permitted to realize one, should not grumble against destiny, especially when he looks upon those projects as duties.

CHAPTER I.

FIRST JOURNEY OF ST. PAUL. — MISSION OF CYPRUS.

UPON their departure from Antioch,¹ Paul and Barnabas, having John-Mark with them, went to Seleucia. It is a short day's journey from Antioch to this latter city. The route follows at a distance the right bank of the Orontes, rising and falling on the last undulations of the mountains of Pieria, and traversing by ford the numerous streams which flow down from them. On all sides there are myrtle underwood, arbutus, laurels, and green oaks; rich villages are suspended in the sharply-cut crests of the mountains. On the left, the plain of the Orontes spreads out its high cultivation. The wooded summits of the mountains of Daphne shut in the horizon on the south. We are now no longer in Syria.² This is a classical, pleasant, fertile, civilized land. All the names recall the powerful Greek colony which gave to these countries so great an historical importance and founded a centre of opposition, at times violent, against the Semitic spirit.

Seleucia³ was the port of Antioch, and the great outlet of Northern Syria toward the west. The city was partly located in the plain and partly on the abrupt heights, toward the angle formed by the alluvia of the Orontes with the foot of the Coryphe,⁴ at about a league and a half north of the mouth of the river. It is there that swarms of degraded beings, offspring of a secular putrefaction, embarked every year to go and fall upon Rome, and infect her.⁵ The dominant religion was that of Mount Casius, a handsome summit, of a regular form, situated on the other side of the Orontes, and with which legends were connected.⁶ The coast is inhospitable and stormy. The winds of the gulf, falling from the mountain heights and taking the waves crosswise, always produces a high sea in the offing. An artificial

basin, communicating with the sea by a narrow entrance, sheltered the vessels from the surge. The mole, formed of huge blocks, and the quays are still in existence,⁷ and await in silence the day near at hand, when Seleucia will become what it formerly was, one of the great *termini* of the globe.⁸ In waving his hand for the last time to the brethren assembled on the black sand of the beach, Paul had before him the beautiful semicircle formed by the coast at the mouth of the Orontes ; on his right, the symmetrical cone of Mount Casius, on which, three hundred years later, was to arise the smoke of the last heathen sacrifice ;⁹ on his left, the rugged slopes of Mount Coryphe ; behind him, the snows of the Taurus and the coast of Cilicia, which shuts in the Gulf of Issus. The hour was solemn. Although it was now several years since Christianity had left its birth-place, still it had not yet crossed the limits of Syria. Now, the Jews considered all Syria, up to the Amanus, as constituting a portion of their holy land, and as taking part in its prerogatives, ceremonies, and duties.¹⁰ This is the very moment in which Christianity really leaves its native land and launches out into the wide world. Paul had already travelled a great deal in order to spread the name of Jesus. He had been a Christian for seven years, and yet his ardent conviction had not slumbered for a single day. His departure from Antioch with Barnabas, marked, nevertheless, a decided change in his character ; he now entered upon that apostolic life, in which he displayed an unequalled activity and an unheard of degree of ardent passion. Journeys were then very difficult unless performed by water ; carriage routes and vehicles scarcely existed. For this reason, the propagation of Christianity took place along the coasts and large rivers. Puteoli and Lyons contained Christians, when a number of the neighboring cities of the cradle of Christianity had not heard Jesus spoken of.

Paul, it appears, almost always went on foot,¹¹ living without doubt upon bread, vegetables, and milk. How many privations, how many trials, in this life of a wandering pedestrian !

The police were negligent or brutal. Seven times was Paul thrown into chains.¹² Therefore, when he could, he preferred to go by water. Of a truth, when calm, these seas are beautiful, but suddenly they seem as if struck with madness; to push upon the beach, to cling to a wreck, is then the only course to take. Peril was everywhere. Says the hero himself, "I have suffered an over-abundance of labors, prisons, stripes, and deaths. Of the Jews, five times received I forty stripes,¹³ save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods;¹⁴ once was I stoned;¹⁵ thrice I suffered shipwreck;¹⁶ a night and a day I have been in the deep.¹⁷ In journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren. In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Such has been my life."¹⁸ Paul wrote that in 56, when his trials were far from terminating. For nearly ten years longer was he to lead this existence which death alone could worthily crown.

In almost all his journeyings, Paul had companions, but he systematically refused himself that consolation from which the other apostles, Peter in particular, drew so much aid and comfort, — I mean a companion in his apostolic mission and labors.¹⁹ His aversion to marriage grew worse from a sentiment of delicacy. He did not wish to impose upon the church the maintenance of two persons. Barnabas followed the same rule. Paul frequently refers to the fact that he costs nothing to the churches. He finds it perfectly just that the apostle should be supported by the community, that the catechist should have everything in common with him whom he catechises;²⁰ but he reduces it to a nicety; he does not wish to profit by his just rights.²¹ His constant custom was, with a single exception, to owe his support to his own labor. This was, in Paul's mind, a question of morality and good example; for one of his proverbs was, that, "He who would not work should not eat."²² He

frankly made it a question of personal economy, fearful lest they should charge him with extravagance, and exaggerated his scruples in order to prevent murmuring. One becomes very particular in questions of money, from living among people who give it so much thought. Wherever Paul made any stay, he established himself, and resumed his trade as a sailmaker.²³ His exterior life resembled that of an artisan who goes about Europe and sows around him the ideas with which he is penetrated.

Such a style of life, impossible in our modern society for any other than an artisan, was easy in the societies in which religious brotherhoods or commercial aristocracies constitute a sort of freemasonry. The life of Arabian travellers, of Ibn-Batoutah, for instance, very much resembles that which Paul must have led. They go from one end of the Mohammedan world to the other, establishing themselves in every large city, exercising there the calling of kahdi, of a physician, marrying there, finding everywhere a welcome, and chances for employment. Benjamin Tudela, and the other Jewish travellers of the Middle Ages, led such a life as this, going from Jewry to Jewry, and entering immediately into an intimacy with their host. These Jewries were separate districts, often closed by a gate, having a religious head. In the centre there was a public court, and generally a place for assembly and prayer. The relations of Jews to each other in our day still present something of the same kind. Wherever Jewish life has remained strongly organized, the journeys of the Israelites take place from *ghetto* to *ghetto* with letters of recommendation. What occurs at Trieste, Constantinople, and Smyrna, in this respect, is a faithful picture of what took place in the days of St. Paul at Ephesus, Thessalonica, and Rome. The new-comer who presents himself on Saturday at the synagogue is observed, surrounded, questioned. They ask him where he is from, who his father is, and what news he brings. In almost all Asia and part of Africa, the Jews have thus quite peculiar facilities for travelling,—thanks to the kind of secret society they constitute, and to the neutrality which

they observe in the domestic struggles of the different countries. Benjamin Tudela arrives from the end of the world without having seen aught else than Jews, Ibn-Batoutah without having seen aught else than Mussulmans.

These little *coteries* formed excellent vehicles for the propagation of doctrines. They were well acquainted with each other; they watched each other unceasingly; nothing was further removed from the common liberty of our modern society in which men come so little into contact with each other. Party divisions become religious in character the very moment politics cease to occupy the first place in the minds of the community. A religious question arising in these circles of the faithful Israelites set everything on fire, brought about schisms and quarrels. Most frequently the religious question was only a firebrand, eagerly seized by antecedent dislikes, a pretext used to obtain influence and reputation. The establishment of Christianity could not be explained without the synagogues with which the coastal region of the Mediterranean was already covered when Paul and the other apostles set out upon their missions. These synagogues had generally no distinctive mark; they were houses like the others, forming, with the districts of which they constituted the centre and the link, a little *vicus* or *angiport*. A distinctive characteristic of these districts was the absence of ornaments sculptured after living objects, which forced them to have recourse to awkward and false means of decoration. But what pointed out the Jewish quarter to the new-comer from Seleucia or Cesarea were the distinctions of race: those young girls clothed in bright colors,—white, red, and green,—no medium shades; those matrons with calm looks, red cheeks, slight *embonpoint*, and kind, motherly eyes. Having arrived and being quickly welcomed, the apostle waited for Saturday. He then went to the synagogue. It was a custom when a stranger, who appeared intelligent or zealous, presented himself, to invite him to address a few profitable words to the people.²⁴ The apostle profited by this custom, and set forth a Christian thesis.

Jesus had proceeded exactly in this way.²⁵ Astonishment was at first the general sentiment. Opposition was not apparent until somewhat later, when conversions had taken place. Then the chiefs of the synagogue took violent measures. Sometimes they ordered the shameful and cruel chastisement inflicted upon heretics to be applied to the apostle; at other times, they appealed to the authorities to have the innovator driven out or scourged. The apostle only preached to the Gentiles after he had concluded with the Jews. The converted heathen were generally less numerous, and still almost all the converts were made in those classes of the population which were already in contact with Judaism, and inclined to embrace it.

This proselytism, as we see, was confined to the cities. The first Christian apostles did not preach in the country. The peasant (*paganus*) was the last to turn Christian. The local *patois* which the Greek had not rooted up in the country, were partially the cause of it. The truth is, a peasantry scattered outside of the cities was very rare in the countries where and at the period in which Christianity first spread itself. The organization of apostolic worship, consisting of assemblies (*ecclesiæ*), was essentially municipal. Islamism is also pre-eminently a religion of the city. It is not complete without its large mosques, its schools, its ulemas, its muezzins.

The gayety, the youthfulness of heart, breathed by these evangelical Odysseys were something new, original, and charming. The Acts of the apostles, an expression of this first transport of the Christian conscience, compose a book of joy,²⁶ of serene ardor. Since the Homeric Poems, no work had been seen full of such fresh sensations. A breeze of morning, an odor of the sea, if I dare express it so, inspiring something joyful and strong, penetrates the whole book, and makes it an excellent *compagnon de voyage*, the exquisite breviary for him who is searching for ancient remains on the seas of the south. This is the second idyl of Christianity. The Lake of Tiberias and its fishing barks had furnished the first. Now, a more powerful

breeze, aspirations toward more distant lands, draw us out into the open sea.

The first point at which the three missionaries landed was the isle of Cyprus, an old land of mixed inhabitants, in which the Grecian and Phenician races, at first placed side by side, had at last melted into one. It was the country of Barnabas, and this circumstance, without a doubt, went toward determining the direction first taken by the mission. Cyprus had already received the seeds of the Christian faith.²⁷ At any rate, the new religion contained several Cypriotes in its fold.²⁸ The number of Jewries there was very considerable.²⁹ But we must not forget that this whole circle of Seleucia, Tarsus, and Cyprus, was very small; that the little group of Jews located at these points represents about the same number as the parent families established at St. Brieuc, St. Malo, and Jersey. Paul and Barnabas again on this occasion scarcely left the country which was familiar to them. The apostolic group landed in the ancient port of Salamis.³⁰ They crossed the whole island from east to west, inclining toward the south, and probably following the coast.

It was the most Phenician part of the island; the cities of Citium, Amathonte, and Paphos were there, old Semitic centres, with their originality still apparent. Paul and Barnabas preached in the synagogues of the Jews. A single incident of this voyage is known to us. It took place at Nea-Paphos,³¹ a modern city which had arisen at some distance from the old city, so celebrated for its worship of Venus (Palaepaphos).³² Nea-Paphos was at this moment apparently the residence of the Roman proconsul³³ who governed the isle of Cyprus. This proconsul was Sergius Paulus, a man of illustrious birth,³⁴ who appeared, as was often the case with the Romans, to have allowed himself to be amused by the illusions and superstitious beliefs of the country to which hazard had brought him.³⁵ He had with him a Jew named Bar-jesus, who was passing himself off for a sorcerer, and assuming a title which they express by *elim*, or

"wise."³⁶ There were produced there scenes like those which took place at Sebasta between the apostles and Simon the magician.³⁷ Bar-jesus opposed Paul and Barnabas violently. Tradition pretended, at a later period, that the affair at stake was the conversion of the proconsul. It is related that in a public discussion, Paul, to overcome his adversary, was obliged to strike him with temporary blindness, and that the proconsul, moved by this miracle, was converted.

The conversion of a Roman of this order, at this period, is a thing absolutely inadmissible.³⁸ Paul without doubt mistook the marks of attention shown him by Sergius for faith ; perhaps even accepted irony for kindness. The Orientals do not comprehend irony. Moreover, their maxim is, that he who is not against me is with me. The curiosity manifested by Sergius Paulus may have appeared in the eyes of the missionaries to be a favorable disposition.³⁹ Like many Romans, Paulus might have been very credulous ; probably the illusions to which it is unfortunately permitted us to think that Paul and Barnabas sometimes had recourse,⁴⁰ appeared to him more striking and greater than those of Bar-jesus. But this feeling of astonishment is far from being akin to a conversion. The legend seems to have assigned to Sergius Paulus the reasoning of a Jew or a Syrian. The Jew and the Syrian regard the miracle as the proof of a doctrine preached by the thaumaturgist. The Roman, if he was educated, regarded the miracle as a trick, affording him some amusement ; if he was credulous and ignorant, as one of those things which happen from time to time. But the miracle in his mind proved no doctrine. Profoundly destitute of religious sentiment, the Romans did not imagine that a dogma could be the design of a God in performing a miracle.⁴¹ The miracle was for them either a sort of fantastic thing rather than natural (the idea of nature's laws was unknown to them, unless they had studied Greek philosophy), or an act revealing the immediate presence of God.⁴² If Sergius Paulus had really believed in Paul's miracles, he would have reasoned as follows :

"This man is very powerful, perhaps he is a god," and not "The doctrine which this man preaches is true."⁴³ At any rate, if the conversion of Sergius Paulus is based upon such slight motives, we believe we would be doing Christianity an honor in not calling it a conversion, and in striking out Sergius Paulus from the number of Christians.

The probability is that he had pleasant relations with the mission, for it remembered him as a wise and good man.⁴⁴ The supposition of St. Jerome,⁴⁵ according to which Paul took his name of Paul from this Sergius Paulus, is only a conjecture, but we cannot say that it is one entirely destitute of probability. It is from this time on, that the author of the *Acts* always substitutes the name of Paul for that of Saul.⁴⁶ Perhaps the apostle adopted Sergius Paulus as his patron, and assumed his name in token of his dependence. It is possible also that Paul, after the example of a large number of Jews, had two names,⁴⁷ the one Hebrew, and the other formed by rudely Grecizing or Latinizing the first (just as *Joseph* was called Hegesippus); and that it was only from the time in which he entered into more continued and direct relations with the heathen world that he began to use solely that of Paul.⁴⁸

We do not know how long the mission of Cyprus lasted. This mission evidently had no great importance, since Paul does not speak of it in his epistles, and that he never thought to revisit the churches which he had established in the island. Perhaps he regarded them as belonging to Barnabas rather than to him. His first attempt in apostolic journeying, at any rate, decided the career of Paul. From this time he assumes the tone of master.⁴⁹ Up to this, he had been subordinate to Barnabas. The latter had been longer in the church; he had introduced Paul, and pledged himself for him. They were superiors of him. In the course of the mission, the rôles are changed. Paul's talent for preaching was the cause of the office as chief speaker devolving entirely upon him.⁵⁰ Henceforth Barnabas will only be a companion of Paul's, one of his *suite*.⁵¹ With an

admirable self-denial, this truly holy man submitted to everything, leaving all to be done by his fearless friend, whose superiority he acknowledged. It was not the same with John-Mark. Dissensions, which were soon to lead to a rupture, broke out between him and Paul.⁵² We have no knowledge of the cause. Probably the principles of Paul in regard to the Jews and Gentiles, shocked the Hierosolymitic prejudices of Mark, and appeared to him in contradiction with the ideas of Peter, his master. Or probably this ever increasing personality of Paul became insupportable to those who saw it every day growing more usurping and arrogant.

It is not likely, however, that from this time Paul took or allowed himself to be given the title of apostle.⁵³ This title had only been borne by the twelve of Jerusalem, up to this ; it was not regarded as transmissible ; it was thought that Jesus alone could have conferred it. Perhaps Paul even at this time had frequently said to himself that he too had received it directly from Jesus in his vision on the journey to Damascus,⁵⁴ but he did not yet openly pretend to so high a distinction. The strong provocations of his enemies were needed to incite him to an act which at first must have flashed upon him as a deed of rashness.

CHAPTER II.

CONTINUATION OF THE FIRST JOURNEY OF ST. PAUL. — MISSION
OF GALATIA.

THE mission, satisfied with what it had done at Cyprus, resolved to try the neighboring coast of Asia Minor. Of the provinces of this country, Cilicia alone had listened to the new preaching and possessed churches.¹ The geographical region which we call Asia Minor did not constitute a whole. It was composed of countries entirely distinct in respect to race and social condition. The western portion and the entire coast had, at a remote period, entered into the great vortex of the general civilization, of which the Mediterranean was the interior sea. Since the decadence of Greece and Ptolemaic Egypt, these countries passed for the most lettered ones there were, or, at least, for those which produced the largest number of distinguished men of letters.² The province of Asia, the ancient kingdom of Pergamus especially, were, as is said nowadays, at the head of progress. But the centre of the peninsula had been but slightly disturbed. Local life continued there as in ancient times.³ Several of the native idioms had not yet disappeared.⁴ The condition of the public roads was very bad.⁵ All these countries had in truth but one characteristic in common, and that, boundless credulity and a great inclination to superstition. The ancient creeds, in their Hellenic and Roman transformation, preserved many of the features of their primitive physiognomy. Several of these religions still enjoyed extreme popularity, and possessed a certain superiority over the Greco-Roman religions. No country produced so many theurgists and theosophists. Apollonius of Tyana, at the period of which we are speaking, was here preparing his fantastic destiny. Alexander of Abonoticus, and Peregrinus Proteus were on the point of gaining over

provinces: the one by his miracles, his prophecies, and his great demonstrations of piety; and the other by his profligate actions.⁷ Artemidorus of Ephesus,⁸ and Ælius Aristides⁹ offer the strange phenomenon of men mixing up sincere and truly religious sentiments with ridiculous superstitions and charlatanical notions. In no part of the empire was the pietistic reaction which took place at the end of the first century in favor of the ancient religions and against positive philosophy more energetic.¹⁰ Asia Minor was, next to Palestine, the most religious country in the world. Entire regions, such as Phrygia, and cities such as Tyana, Venases, Comana, Cesarea of Cappadocia, and Nazianza, were as if given up to mysticism.¹¹ In several places, the priests were still almost sovereigns.¹²

As to political life, there was no trace of it left. All the cities, as if in emulation of one another, were wild in their unbridled adulation of the Cæsars and the Roman functionaries.¹³ The title "Friend of Cæsar" was sought for.¹⁴ The cities, with puerile vanity, disputed for the pompous titles of "metropolis," "very illustrious," conferred by imperial edict.¹⁵ The country had been brought under the Roman authority without violent conquest,¹⁶ at least without national resistance. History does not mention a single serious political uprising. Brigandage and anarchy, which for a long while had had impregnable fortresses in Taurus, Isauria, and Pisidia, at last succumbed to the efforts of the Romans and their allies.¹⁷ Civilization spread with an astonishing rapidity.¹⁸ Traces of the beneficent action of Claudius and of the popular gratitude toward him were, in spite of certain tumultuous movements,¹⁹ everywhere²⁰ met with. It was not as in Palestine, where old institutions and old customs offer an obstinate resistance. If we except Isauria, Pisidia, those portions of Cilicia which still had a shadow of independence, and up to a certain point Galatia, the country had lost every national sentiment. It never had any dynasty proper. The old provincial individualities of Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria had long ceased to exist as political unities. The artificial king-

doms of Pergamus, Bithynia, and Pontus were also gone. The entire peninsula had accepted the Roman rule with happiness.²¹ It can be added, with gratitude. Never, in truth, did any domination succeed in gaining popular acknowledgment by so many acts of kindness. "August Providence" was truly the tutelary genius of the country.²² The worship of the emperor Augustus, in particular, and of Livia, was the dominant religion of Asia Minor.²³ The temples to these terrestrial gods, always associated with the divinity of Rome,²⁴ increased in number on all sides.²⁵ The priests of Augustus, grouped by provinces, under archpriests (*ἀρχιερεῖς*), a kind of metropolitans or primates, eventually formed a clergy analogous to what the Christian clergy was from the accession of Constantine.²⁶ The political testament of Augustus had become a sort of sacred text, a public lesson, which beautiful monuments were made to offer to the gaze of all and to render eternal.²⁷ The cities and tribes vied with each other in epithets attesting the remembrance, which they still cherished, of the great emperor.²⁸ The ancient Ninoe²⁹ of Caria turned his back on his old Assyrian creed of Melita, in order to establish his connections with Cæsar, son of Venus.³⁰ There was servility and baseness in all this;³¹ but there was above all the sentiment of a new era, of a happiness unenjoyed by them up to this time, and which, in truth, was to last for ages without any shadow. A man who was perhaps a witness of the conquest of his country, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, wrote a Roman history in order to show to his countrymen the excellence of the Roman people, and to prove to them that this people was of the same race as they, and that their glory was in part theirs too.

After Egypt and Cyrenaicus, Asia Minor was the country with the most Jews. Here they formed powerful communities, jealous of their rights, given to asking for persecution, having the bad habit of always complaining to the Roman authority, and of having recourse to protection outside of the city. They had succeeded in having strong guarantees granted them, and

they were in reality privileged in comparison to the other classes of the population. Not only indeed was their worship free, but several of the common burdens which they pretended to be contrary to their consciences did not weigh upon them. The Romans were very favorable to them in these provinces, and almost always let them have their way in the troubles which they had with the people of the country.³²

Having embarked at Nea-Paphos, the three missionaries sailed toward the mouth of the Cestrus in Pamphylia, and, going up the river for a distance of two or three leagues,³³ arrived off Perga, a large and flourishing city,³⁴ the centre of the ancient worship of Diana, almost as celebrated as that of Ephesus.³⁵ This worship bore a strong resemblance to that of Paphos.³⁶ It is not impossible that the relations of the two cities, establishing between them a line of ordinary navigation, should have determined the route of the apostles. In general, the two parallel coasts of Cyprus and Asia Minor appear to correspond to each other, on both sides.³⁷ There were in both portions Semitic populations, a medley of different elements, who had lost a great deal of their primitive character.³⁸

It was at Perga that the rupture occurred between Paul and John-Mark. John-Mark left the mission and returned to Jerusalem. This circumstance was doubtless very unpleasant to Barnabas, for John-Mark was a relative of his.³⁹ But Barnabas, accustomed to take everything from his imperious companion, did not abandon the grand plan of penetrating into Asia Minor. The two apostles, striking into the country, and journeying toward the north, enter the basins of the Cestrus and the Eurymedon, across Pamphylia and Pisidia, and advance to mountainous Phrygia. This must have been a difficult and dangerous journey.⁴⁰ This labyrinth of rugged mountains was held by barbarous people, given to brigandage, and who had scarcely been subdued by the Romans.⁴¹ Paul, accustomed to the aspect of Syria, must have been surprised at these picturesque and romantic Alpine regions, with their lakes and deep

valleys, which might be compared to the environs of Lake Maggiore and the Ticino.⁴² At first thought, we are surprised at the singular route of the apostles, a route which led them away from the grand centres and most frequented roads. Without doubt, upon this occasion, too, they followed the trail of Jewish emigrations. Pisidia and Lycaonia had cities such as Antioch of Pisidia, and Iconium, in which large Jewish colonies had established themselves. These Jews here made many conversions.⁴³ Far removed from Jerusalem, and out of the influence of Palestinian fanaticism, they lived in harmony with the heathen.⁴⁴ The latter went to the synagogue.⁴⁵ Mixed marriages were not at all rare.⁴⁶ Paul had been able to learn at Tarsus what advantageous conditions the new faith would find there to establish itself and bear fruit. Derbe and Lystra are not very far from Tarsus. Paul's family may have had connections in this neighborhood; or, at least, been well informed concerning these out-of-the-way districts.

Having left Perga, the two apostles, after a journey of about forty leagues, arrived at Antioch of Pisidia, or Antioch-Cesarea,⁴⁷ in the heart of the high table-lands of the peninsula.⁴⁸ This Antioch had remained a city of medium importance up to the time in which it had been raised by Augustus to the dignity of a Roman colony, with Italic privileges.⁵⁰ It then became very considerable, and partly changed its character. Up to that time it had been a city of priests, apparently resembling Comana. The temple, with its legions of hierodules and rich domains, which had rendered the city famous, was suppressed by the Romans (25 B. C.)⁵¹ But this great religious establishment, as is often the case, left deep traces in the manners of the people. Without a doubt it was in the wake of the Roman colony that the Jews had been attracted to Antioch of Pisidia.

According to their custom, the two apostles went to the synagogue on Saturday. After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the chiefs, seeing two strangers of apparently pious mien, sent to ask them if they had any word of exhortation to

say to the people. Paul spoke, set forth the mystery of Jesus, his death, his resurrection. The impression was vivid; they begged them to recommence their preaching on the following Saturday. A large crowd of Jews and proselytes followed them on leaving the synagogue, and during the whole week Paul and Barnabas did not cease to exercise an active ministry. The heathen population heard this incident spoken of, and its curiosity was excited by it.

The following Saturday the whole city was gathered together at the synagogue, but the sentiments of the orthodox party had undergone a great change. They regretted having shown such tolerance on the preceding Saturday. This eager multitude provoked the chiefs. A dispute, mingled with hard words, arose. Paul and Barnabas sustained the storm bravely; nevertheless, they could not speak in the synagogue. They retired, with this protest to the Jews: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." From this time on, in truth,⁵² Paul strengthened himself more and more in the opinion that the future was not to the Jews but to the Gentiles; that preaching upon this virgin soil would bear far better fruits; that God had specially chosen him to be the apostle of the nations to announce the glad tidings to the very ends of the world. It was a peculiar characteristic of his great soul to grow great and expand without ceasing. I know of no other than the soul of Alexander which had this gift of boundless vigor, this unlimited capacity of will and action.

The minds of the heathen population were favorably disposed. Several of them were converted, and became at the start perfect Christians. We shall see the same thing take place at Philippi, at Alexandria, Troas, and in general throughout the Roman colonies. The inclination which these good and religious people had experienced toward a refined worship, an inclination which had up to this time manifested itself by conversions to Judaism, will now become apparent through conversions to Christianity.

In spite of their strange religion, and perhaps through a reaction against this religion, the people of Antioch, as in general those of Phrygia, had a sort of penchant toward monotheism.⁵³ The new religion, not exacting circumcision nor calling for certain mean observances, was much better constituted than Judaism to attract the pious heathens; therefore, the preference quickly inclined to its side. These out-of-the-way provinces, lost among the mountains, slightly subjected to authority, without historical reputation, or of any importance whatever, were an excellent *terrain* of the faith. Quite a numerous church was established. Antioch of Pisidia became a centre of Propaganda, from which the doctrine diverged in all directions.

The success of the new preaching among the heathen succeeded in arousing the fury of the Jews. A pious intrigue was formed against the missionaries. Several of the most respectable ladies of the city had embraced Judaism. The orthodox Jews persuaded them to speak to their husbands, in order to obtain the expulsion of Paul and Barnabas. The two apostles, in truth, were banished by municipal decree from the city and territory of Antioch of Pisidia.⁵⁴

According to apostolic usage, they shook off the dust of their feet against them.⁵⁵ Then they turned their steps toward Lycaonia, and reached, after a journey of about five days through a fertile country,⁵⁶ the city of Iconium. Lycaonia was, like Pisidia, an unknown country of little consideration, and one which had preserved its ancient customs. Patriotism still existed there,⁵⁷ the morals were pure, and the minds dignified and upright.⁵⁸ Iconium was a city of old religions and old traditions,⁵⁹—traditions which, in a great many respects, even bear some resemblance to those of the Jews.⁶⁰ The city, up to that time very small,⁶¹ had just received, or was on the eve of receiving from Claudius, when Paul arrived there, the title of colony. A high Roman functionary, Lucius Pupius Præsens, procurator of Galatia, had himself called the second founder

of it, and the city changed its ancient name for that of *Claudia* or *Claudiconium*.⁶²

The Jews, doubtless on account of this circumstance, were very numerous⁶³ there, and had gained many partisans. Paul and Barnabas preached in the synagogue. A church was organized. The missionaries made Iconium the second centre of a very active apostolate, and remained there a long while.⁶⁴ It was there, that, according to a very popular romance, dating from the first half of the third century,⁶⁵ Paul is said to have won the most beautiful of his disciples, the faithful and love-inspiring Thecla.⁶⁶ This history is not based upon any reality. The question is asked, nevertheless, if it was through arbitrary choice that the priest of Asia, author of the romance, chose the city of Iconium for the scene of his story. In our day, the Greek women of this country are still celebrated for their seductive charms, and present phenomena of endemic hysteria, attributed by physicians to the climate.⁶⁷ However it may be, the success of the apostles was very great. Many of the Jews were converted,⁶⁸ but the apostles made still more proselytes outside of the synagogue.⁶⁹ In the midst of those sympathetic people who were no longer satisfied with the old creeds, Paul's beautiful system of morality delighted the good Lycaonians.⁷⁰ Their credulity, moreover, disposed them to receive with admiration what they considered as miracles and supernatural manifestations of the Spirit.⁷¹

The storm which had forced the preachers to leave Antioch of Pisidia broke out again at Iconium. The orthodox Jews strove to arouse the heathen population against the missionaries. The city was divided into two parties. There was a disturbance. They talked of stoning the two apostles. The latter fled, and left the capital of Lycaonia.⁷²

Iconium is situated near a lake, at the entrance to the great *steppe* which forms the centre of Asia Minor, and which has, up to this time, rebelled against all civilization. The road toward Galatia, properly speaking, and Cappadocia was closed. Paul

and Barnabas set out to skirt the foot of the arid mountains which form a semicircle around the plain of the south side. These mountains are nothing else than the northern face of the Taurus, but the central plain being very high above the level of the sea, the Taurus attains on this side a medium elevation. The country is cold, and without variety; the soil, sometimes marshy, sometimes sandy, or cracked open by the heat, looks sad and dreary. The mass of the extinct volcano, now called Karadagh,⁷³ alone appears, like an island in the midst of this boundless sea.⁷⁴

Two little obscure towns, whose situation we are ignorant of, then became the scene of the apostle's action. These two little towns were named Lystra and Derbe.⁷⁵ Lost in the valleys of the Karadagh, or in the midst of poor inhabitants, occupied with the rearing of flocks, at the foot of one of the most obstinate strongholds of robbers known to antiquity,⁷⁶ these two towns had remained entirely provincial. A civilized Roman here believed himself among savages.⁷⁷ Lycaonian was the language of the country.⁷⁸ There were very few Jews there.⁷⁹ Claudius, by the establishment of colonies in the inaccessible regions of the Taurus,⁸⁰ gave to these disowned districts more order and security than they had ever possessed.

Lystra was the first to receive the Gospel.⁸¹ A singular incident took place there. In the early part of the apostle's sojourn in the city, the report was spread that Paul had miraculously healed a lame man. These credulous and wonder-loving people immediately indulged in a strange freak of imagination. They thought that the apostles were two divinities, who had assumed a human form in order to visit the mortals. The belief in these descents of the gods was widely spread, above all in Asia Minor. The life of Apollonius of Tyana was soon to be regarded as the journey of a god on earth.⁸² Tyana is not far from Derbe. As an old Phrygian tradition, consecrated by a temple, an annual festivity, and by interesting stories,⁸³ pictured Jupiter travelling this way with Mercury, they applied

the names of these two divine travellers to the apostles. Barnabas, who was taller than Paul, they called Jupiter; and Paul, who was the chief speaker, they called Mercury. There was a temple of Jupiter's⁸⁴ just outside of the city gate. The priest, informed that a divine manifestation had taken place, began to prepare a sacrifice, the bulls had already been led up, and the garlands brought before the pediment of the temple,⁸⁵ when Barnabas and Paul arrived, rending their clothes, and affirming that they are only men. These heathen races, as we have already observed, attached quite a different meaning to a miracle than what the Jews do. The latter considered a miracle a doctrine of argument; the former held it to be the immediate revelation of a god. The effort of the apostles, when they preached to a people of this kind, was rather to preach God than Jesus. Their preaching became purely Jewish, or rather Deistical.⁸⁶ Jews, inclined to proselytism, have always felt that it is the monotheistic basis of their religion, which alone is suitable for the universality of mankind, and that all the rest, Mosaic institutions, Messianic ideas, and so forth, form, as a second degree of beliefs constituting the particular appurtenance of the children of Israel, a sort of family inheritance, which is not transmissible.

As Lystra had few or no Jews of Palestinian origin, the life of the apostle there was for a long while very tranquil. One family of this city was the centre and the school of the greatest piety. It was composed of a grandmother, named Lois, of a mother named Eunice,⁸⁷ and of a young son named Timothy.⁸⁸ The two women doubtless professed the Jewish religion, as proselytes. Eunice had been married to a heathen,⁸⁹ who probably was dead when Paul and Barnabas arrived. Timothy was growing up, in the care of these two women, a student in sacred letters, and with sentiments of the liveliest devotion; but, as it frequently happens with the most pious proselytes, his parents did not have him circumcised.⁹⁰ Paul converted the two women. Timothy, who may have been about fifteen years

old, was initiated into the Christian faith by his mother and his grandmother.

The report of these conversions spread to Iconium, and to Antioch of Pisidia, and reawakened the anger of the Jews in those two cities. They sent emissaries to Lystra, who provoked a disturbance. Paul was seized by the fanatics, dragged out of the city, stoned, and left for dead.⁹¹ The disciples went to his assistance ; his wounds were not serious ; he returned to the city, probably in the night, and the next day departed with Barnabas for Derbe.

They made another long stay there, and gained many souls. The two churches of Lystra and Derbe were the first two churches, composed almost entirely of heathens. We conceive what difference there must have been between such churches and those of Palestine, established in the bosom of pure Judaism ; or even that of Antioch, formed around Jewish influences, and in a society already Judaized. Here, there were entirely new subjects, very religious, and good provincials, but of a turn of imagination very different from that of the Syrians. Up to that time, Christian preaching had only borne fruit in large cities, where there was found a numerous population working at trades. Henceforth, there were churches in small towns. Neither Iconium, nor Lystra, nor Derbe was considerable enough to constitute a mother church, after the manner of Corinth or Ephesus. Paul was accustomed to designate his Christians of Lycaonia by the name of the province which they inhabited. Now, this province was Galatia, in the administrative sense which the Romans had attached to this word.

In fact, the Roman province of Galatia was far from containing only this country, peopled by Gallic adventurers, and having the city of Ancyra for its centre.⁹² It was an artificial agglomeration, corresponding to the temporary reunion of provinces which took place under the hand of the Galatian king, Amyntas. This personage, after the battle of Philippi, and the death of Dejotara, received Pisidia⁹³ from Antoninus, and after-

ward Galatia, with a portion of Lycaonia and Pamphylia.⁹⁴ He was confirmed by Augustus in this possession.⁹⁵ At the end of his reign (25 B. C.) Amyntas, besides Galatia, properly speaking, possessed Lycaonia and Isauria as far as Derbe, inclusively, the south-east and east of Phrygia, with the cities of Antioch and Apollonia, Pisidia, and Cilicia-Trachea.⁹⁶ All these countries, at his death, formed a single Roman province,⁹⁷ with the exception of Cilicia-Trachea⁹⁸ and the Pamphylian cities.⁹⁹ The province which bore the name of Galatia in the official nomenclature, at least, under the first Cæsars, then certainly comprised: 1st, Galatia, properly speaking; 2d, Lycaonia;¹⁰⁰ 3d, Pisidia;¹⁰¹ 4th, Isauria;¹⁰² and 5th, Mountainous Phrygia, with its cities of Apollonia and Antioch.¹⁰³ This state of things lasted a long while,¹⁰⁴ and Ancyra was the capital of this great *ensemble*, comprising almost all of central Asia Minor.¹⁰⁵ The Romans were not averse, in order to destroy nationalities and root out recollections, to this changing of the old geographical preferences, and creation of arbitrary administrative groups analogous to our departments.¹⁰⁶

Paul was accustomed to make use of the administrative name,¹⁰⁷ in order to designate each country. The country which he had evangelized, from Antioch of Pisidia to Derbe, he called "Galatia," and the Christians of this country "Galatians."¹⁰⁸ This name remained very dear to him. The churches of Galatia were reckoned among those for which the apostle had most tenderness, and who had for him the most personal attachment. The recollection of the friendship and devotion which he had met with among these kind souls was one of the strongest impressions of his apostolic life.¹⁰⁹ Several circumstances redoubled the vividness of these recollections. It appears that, during the sojourn in Galatia, the apostle was subject to fits of weakness, or sickness, which attacked him frequently. The care and attention went to his heart.¹¹⁰ The persecutions which they had to suffer together¹¹¹ succeeded in creating a strong bond between them. This little Lycaonian

centre had, for this reason, a great deal of importance. St. Paul loved to revert to it as his first creation. It was from there that he at a later day drew two of his most faithful companions, Timothy and Caius.¹¹²

It was now four or five years that he had thus been confining himself to quite a limited circle. He thought then less of those long and rapid journeys, which towards the end of his life became a sort of passion for him, than of firmly establishing churches, which might serve him as points of support. We do not know whether, during this time, he had connections with the church of Antioch, from which he had received his mission. A desire of revisiting this mother church was awakened within him. He resolved to make a journey thither, and took the same route back which he had already passed over. The two missionaries visited Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia, for the second time. They made new sojourns in these cities, strengthening the faithful in their faith, exhorting them to perseverance and patience, and telling them that it is through tribulation that we enter into the kingdom of God. The constitution of these out-of-the-way churches was, moreover, very simple. The apostles chose elders in each one of them, who were, after their departure, the depositaries of their authority. The ceremony of parting was touching. There were fastings and prayers, after which the apostles recommended the faithful to God, and set out.

From Antioch of Pisidia, the missionaries again visited Perga. It appears that their mission there at this time was crowned with success.¹¹³ The cities of processions, pilgrimages, and great annual panegyres, were frequently favorable to the preaching of the apostles. From Perga, they went in one day to Attalia, the great port of Pamphylia.¹¹⁴ From there they embarked for Seleucia, and then re-entered the great Antioch, where, five years before, they had been given up to the grace of God.

The extent of this mission had been very small. It had em-

braced the isle of Cyprus, longitudinally speaking, and in Asia Minor, an irregular line of about a hundred leagues. This was the first instance of an apostolic journey of this kind. Nothing was organized. Paul and Barnabas had to struggle with great exterior difficulties. We must not look upon these journeys like those of a Francis Xavier, or a Livingstone, supported by rich associations. The apostles much more resembled socialistic artisans, spreading their ideas from inn to inn, than missionaries of modern times. Their trade had remained a necessity to them. They were obliged to halt in order to exercise it, and to conform themselves to the localities where they found work. Hence they met with delays, stagnant seasons, and a thousand losses of time. In spite of the enormous obstacles, the general results of this first mission were very great. When Paul set out to return to Antioch, Gentile churches were in existence. The great step had been taken. All previous action in this direction had produced no decisive results. Up to this time, they had been enabled to reply more or less plausibly to the true Jews of Jerusalem, who sustained that circumcision was the obligatory preliminary of the Christian faith. But now, the question was met in a direct way. Another fact of the greatest importance was also brought to light. This was the admirable readiness that could be found with certain races attached to the mythological worship to receive the Gospel. Evidently, the doctrine of Jesus was going to profit by the sort of charm which Judaism had up to that time exercised upon the pious heathen. Asia Minor, above all, was designed to become the second Christian land. After the disasters which are soon going to fall upon the churches of Palestine, it will be the principal home of the new faith, the scene of its most important transformations.

CHAPTER III.

FIRST TROUBLE ARISING FROM CIRCUMCISION.

THE return of Paul and Barnabas was hailed in the church of Antioch with a cry of joy. The entire street of Singon¹ wore a festive look. The church assembled together. The two missionaries related their adventures and the things that God had done for them. "God himself," they said, "has opened the gate of faith to the Gentiles." They spoke of the churches of Galatia, almost all composed of the heathen. The church of Antioch which a long time before had, for its part, recognized the rights of the Gentiles to baptism, approved of their conduct. The apostles remained here several months, resting from their labors and strengthening themselves at this source of apostolic spirit.² It was then, it appears, that Paul converted and took for disciple, companion, and coadjutor,³ a young man named Titus,⁴ uncircumcised, and born of heathen parents, and whom we shall henceforth see with the apostle.

A grave dissension, which came near destroying the work of Jesus, broke out about this time, and placed the young church on the very brink of destruction. This dissension partook of the very essence of the situation. It was inevitable. It was a crisis which the new religion could not avoid passing through.

Jesus, in carrying religion to the very highest summits to which it has ever been borne, had not plainly stated whether it was his intention to remain Jew or not. He had not designated the portion of Judaism which he wished to preserve. At times, he declared that he had come to confirm the law of Moses; at others, to supplant it. To tell the truth, this was, for a great poet like him, an insignificant detail. The moment we know the heavenly Father, him whom we adore in mind and truth, we no longer belong to any sect, any particular religion, or school. We belong to the true religion. All practices become indifferent. We do not despise them, for they are signs which have been, or

are respectable, but we cease to ascribe any intrinsic virtue to them. Circumcision, baptism, passover, unleavened bread, sacrifices, — all these become equally secondary. They are no longer thought of. But no uncircumcised took sides frankly with Jesus, while living. The question had no opportunity to propose itself. Like all men of genius, Jesus only thought of the soul. The most important practical questions, those which appeared to be the main ones to inferior minds, those which caused most torment to men of application, had no existence in his thoughts.

At his death, the disorder had been general. Left to themselves, deprived of him who had been a complete living theology for them, they returned to the practices of Jewish piety. They were people pious in the highest degree. Now the piety of that day was entirely Jewish. They kept their customs, and resumed those little practices which ordinary people looked upon as the essence of Judaism. The people regarded them as holy. By a singular tacking about, the Pharisees, who had served as a butt to the fine ridicule of Jesus, became almost reconciled to his disciples.⁵ It was the Sadducees who showed themselves irreconcilable enemies of the new movement. The exact observance of the law seemed the first condition, in order to become a Christian.

At an early day, great difficulties were met with from this manner of thinking ; for so soon as the Christian family began to enlarge, it would be precisely among the people of non-Israelitish origin, among the sympathetic and uncircumcised adherents of Judaism, that the new faith would gain its largest accessions. To oblige them to have themselves circumcised was impossible. Peter, with an admirable show of practical good sense, recognized this well. On the other side, timid minds, such as James, the brother of the Lord, considered it the greatest impiety to admit heathens into the church, and to eat with them. Peter deferred the whole solution as long as he could.

In a word, the Jews on their side had found themselves in the same situation, and had pursued a similar course. When prose-

lytes or partisans were being gained on all sides, the question had presented itself to them. A few progressive minds, good, plain, thinking laymen, not subject to the influence of the doctors, did not insist upon circumcision. At times they even dissuaded the new converts from having it performed.⁷ These kind and simple hearts wished to have the world saved, and sacrificed everything else to this idea. The orthodox ones, on the contrary, with the disciples of Shammai, declared circumcision indispensable. Opposed to proselytism among the Gentiles, they did nothing to facilitate accessions to their religion. On the contrary, they manifested in regard to converts a certain contumaciousness. Shammai drove them away from him, it is said, with blows from a stick.⁸ This division was clearly apparent in the royal family of Adiabene. A Jew named Anania, who converted them, and who was in no wise a learned man, strongly dissuaded Izate from having himself circumcised. "One can," said he, "live entirely like a Jew, without circumcision. To worship God is the really important thing." The pious Helen was of the same opinion. A rigorist, named Eliazar, declared, on the contrary, that if the king did not have himself circumcised, he would be an impious man ; that it was of no use to read the law if they did not observe it ; that the first precept was circumcision. The king followed this opinion, at the risk of losing his crown.⁹ The petty kings who embraced Judaism with a view to the rich marriages offered them by the family of Herod submitted to the same ceremony.¹⁰ But true piety was of a less facile nature than policy and avarice. Many of the pious neophytes led a Jewish life without having subjected themselves to a rite which was commonly looked upon as opening access to it.¹¹ This was for them a cause of perpetual trouble. Bigoted society, in which prejudices are strong, is accustomed to construe its religious practices into acts of *bon ton*, of good education.¹² While in France, the religious man, in order to confess his piety, is obliged to overcome a sort of shame, of worldly consideration ; with the mussulmans, on the contrary, a man who

practises his religion is the honest man. He who is not a good mussulman cannot be considered as a respectable person; his position corresponds to that of a coarse, an ill-mannered rustic. In the same way, he who does not observe the Sabbath in England or the United States is outlawed by good society. Among the Jews, the position of the uncircumcised was still worse. Contact with such a man had in their eyes something insupportable. Circumcision appeared to them to be obligatory for any one who wished to live with them.¹³ He who did not submit to it was a creature of the lower grade, a sort of impure animal whom they shunned, a pitiful wretch, with whom a man of good society could have no connections.

The great duality existing in the bosom of Judaism is here revealed. The law, essentially restrictive, made to isolate, was of an entirely different spirit from the prophets which dreamed of the conversion of the world, and embraced such large horizons. Two words borrowed from the Talmudic language express well the difference to which we have reference. The *agada*, opposed to the *halaka*, designates popular preaching, its aim being the conversion of the heathen, in opposition to the learned casuistry which only thinks of a strict execution of the law, without aiming to convert any one. To use the language of the Talmud, the Gospels are the *agadas*; the Talmud, on the contrary, is the extreme expression of the *halaka*. It is the *agada* which has conquered the world, and constitutes Christianity; the *halaka* is the source of orthodox Judaism, which still exists without wishing to enlarge itself. The *agada* presents itself as a thing principally Galilean; the *halaka* as a thing entirely Hierosolymitic. Jesus, Hillel, and the authors of the apocalypses and apocryphas are *agadistes*, pupils of the prophets, inheritors of their boundless aspirations; Shammai, the Talmudists, and the Jews, subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, are *halakistes*, followers of the law with its strict observances. We shall see the fanaticism of the law increasing every day until the supreme crisis of the year seventy, and on the eve

of the nation's great disaster, ending in a sort of reaction against the doctrines of Paul, in those 'eighteen measures' which henceforth rendered impossible all connection between the Jews and the non-Jews, and opened the sad history of exclusive, hating and hated Judaism, which was the Judaism of the middle ages, and is still the Judaism of the orient.

It is clear that, for growing Christianity, this was the point on which the future depended.¹⁴ Should Judaism impose its peculiar rites upon the multitudes who embraced it or not? Should a distinction be established between the monotheistic basis which constituted its nature, and the observances with which it was laden? If the former party had triumphed as the Shamaites desired, the Jewish propaganda would have ceased. It is a very certain thing that the world would not have turned Jew, in the narrow sense of the word. What composed the charm of Judaism was not the rites which did not differ in principle from those of other religions, it was its theological simplicity. It was accepted as a sort of deism, of religious philosophy, and in truth, in the mind of a Philo, for instance, Judaism had associated itself very well with philosophical speculations.

With the Essenes, it had assumed the form of a social Utopia; with the author of the poem attributed to Phocylides,¹⁵ it had become a simple catechism of good sense and honesty; and with the author of the treatise on "The Empire of Reason,"¹⁶ a sort of stoicism. Judaism, like all religions at first founded upon caste and nationality, was encumbered with practices destined to separate the believer from the rest of the world. These practices were no more than an obstacle, from the very day Judaism justly aspired to become the universal religion, without exclusion or separation. It was on the deism and not Mosaicism that it was to become the universal religion of humanity. "Love all men," said Hillel, "and bring them near to the law. Do not do to others what you would not wish that they should do to you. This is the whole law, the rest is the commentary."¹⁷

Let one read the treatises of Philo, entitled, "Concerning the Life of Contemplation," or, "That Every Honest Man is Free"; let one read even certain parts of the Sibylline verses, written by Jews,¹⁸ and one is led into an order of ideas which has nothing specially Jewish, into a world of general mysticism, which is no more Jewish than Buddhist or Pythagorean. The Pseudo-Phocylides even goes so far as to suppress the Sabbath. We feel that all these men, anxious for the amelioration of humanity, wish to reduce Judaism to a code of general morality, to free it from all its particularities, from everything which makes a limited religion of it.

In fact, three main reasons existed in explanation of the great exclusiveness of Judaism: they were circumcision, the forbidding of mixed marriages, and the distinction in regard to forbidden or lawful meats. Circumcision was, for adults, a painful ceremony, one not without danger, and disagreeable to the highest degree. It was one of the reasons which interdicted ordinary life to the Jews, and transformed them into a caste by themselves.¹⁹ At the baths and gymnasiums, those important parts of the ancient cities, circumcision exposed the Jew to all sorts of affronts. Every time that the attention of the Greeks and Romans was directed to this subject, outbursts of jesting followed. The Jews were very sensitive in this regard, and avenged themselves by cruel reprisals.²⁰ Several of them, in order to escape the ridicule, and wishing to pass themselves off for Greeks, strove to efface their original mark by a surgical operation²¹ of which Celsus has preserved us the details.²² As to the converts who accepted this initiation ceremony, they had only one course to pursue, and that was, to hide themselves in order to escape sarcastic taunts. Never did a man of the world place himself in such a position; and this is doubtless the reason why conversions to Judaism were much more numerous among the women than among the men,²³ the former not finding in it at first, a repulsive and in all respects shocking experience. We have many examples of Jewesses married to heathens, but not a

single one of a Jew married to a heathen woman. Hence, there arose many disturbances, and there was a need felt for the coming of some liberal casuist, who might restore peace to these troubled households.

Mixed marriages were the origin of the same kind of difficulties. The Jews regarded these marriages as pure fornication.²⁴ It was the crime which the *kanaim* punished with the dagger, simply because the law, not prescribing any punishment for it, left its suppression to the arm of the zealot.²⁵ Although bound together by the faith and the love of Christ, two Christians could thus be prevented from contracting marriage. The Israelite converted to Jesus, who wished to marry a sister of Grecian blood, heard this union, sacred in his eyes, called by the most outrageous names.²⁶

The ordinances in regard to pure and impure meats were of less consequence. We can judge of this by what takes place in our day. As nudity enters no longer into modern customs, circumcision has lost all its inconveniences for the Israelites. But the necessity of separate slaughter-houses has remained a source of trouble to them. It requires those who are strict not to eat with Christians, and consequently to sequester themselves from general society. This rule is the principal cause which still holds Judaism in many countries in the position of a cloistered sect. In those countries in which the Israelites are not separated from the rest of the nation, it forms a stumbling-block. In order to understand this, it is sufficient to have seen to what point the puritan Jews, coming from Germany or Poland, are shocked at the licenses which their co-religionists indulge in, on this side of the Rhine. In such cities as Salamanca, where the majority of the population are Jewish, and where the wealth is in Jewish hands, lively social intercourse is thus rendered impossible. Even antiquity complained of these restrictions.²⁷ A Jewish law, remnant of remote ages, in which precautions for cleanliness constituted an essential part of religious legislation, gave an infamous reputation to the swine, and one which had no right

to exist in Europe. This old antipathy, the mark of an oriental origin, appeared puerile to the Greeks and Romans.²⁸ A great number of other ordinances arose at a period in which one of the foremost thoughts of civilizers was to prevent those under them from eating unclean things, from touching carrion. Finally, the hygiene of marriage had prescribed for women a rather complicated code of legal impurities. The peculiar characteristic of these kinds of ordinances is to outlive the day in which their existence was justified, and finally to become as inconvenient as they may have been good and salutary at the beginning.

A peculiar circumstance attached considerable weight to the ordinances respecting meats. The meats coming from sacrifices were held to be unclean.²⁹ Now these meats, after the sacrifices, were frequently carried to the market,³⁰ where it was very difficult to distinguish them. Hence arose inextricable scruples. The strict Jews did not regard it as lawful to buy provision promiscuously in the market; they desired that the seller should be questioned concerning the origin of the meat, and that before accepting the dishes the host should be questioned concerning the manner in which he had procured his provisions.³¹ To impose this burthen of casuistry upon the neophytes would evidently have spoiled everything. Christianity would not have been Christianity, if, like the Judaism of our day, it had been forced to have slaughter-houses by itself, and if the Christian had not been able to eat with other men without violating his duties. When we have seen in what a network of difficulties life is enclosed by religions overladen with ordinances,³² when we have seen the Jew and the Mussulman of the orient separated by their ritualistic laws, as it were by a wall, from the European world, we comprehend the immense importance of the questions which were being decided at the period of which we are speaking.

The question arose whether Christianity should be a formalistic and ritualistic religion, a religion of ablutions, purifications, and distinctions between pure and impure things, or rather the

religion of the spirit, the idealistic worship which has slain or will slay, little by little, religious materialism, together with all practices and all ceremonies. Or, to express it better, the question arose whether Christianity should be a petty sect, or a universal religion; whether the conception of Jesus should be overturned through the incapacity of his disciples, or whether this conception by its primitive force should triumph over the scruples of a few narrow, backward minds, which were upon the point of substituting themselves in its place and destroying it.

The mission of Paul and Barnabas had put the question with such a force that there was no longer any means of recoiling before its solution. Paul, who in the first period of his preaching had, it appears, preached circumcision,³³ now declared it useless. He had admitted the heathen into the church at the start. He had formed Gentile churches. Titus, his intimate friend, was not circumcised. The church of Jerusalem could no longer close its eyes upon such notorious facts. Generally speaking, this church was, with reference to the subject now under consideration, either vacillating, or favorable to the most backward party. The conservative senate was there. Neighbors of the Temple, and in perpetual contact with the Pharisees, the old apostles' narrow and timid minds did not countenance the profoundly revolutionary theories of Paul. Many Pharisees, moreover, had embraced Christianity without renouncing the essential principles of their sect.³⁴ To suppose that one could be saved without being circumcised was a blasphemy in the minds of such persons. To them the law appeared to exist in its entirety. They were told that Jesus had come to put his seal upon it, not to repeal it. The privilege of the children of Abraham appeared to them intact. The Gentiles could not enter into the kingdom of God without having first affiliated themselves to the family of Abraham. In a word, before being a Christian it was necessary to become a Jew. It is evident that Christianity never had a more fundamental doubt to clear up. If one had been willing to believe the Jewish party, even the *Agape*, the

repast in common, would have been impossible. The two halves of the church of Jesus would not have been able to communicate with one another. In a theological point of view, the matter was still graver: the question arose whether they were saved by the works of the Law, or by the grace of Jesus Christ.

Several members of the church of Judea having come to Antioch without any mission, it appears, from the apostolic body,³⁵ incited the discussion.³⁶ They declared loudly that no one could be saved without circumcision. It must not be forgotten that the Christians who at Antioch had a name and a particular individuality, had none at Jerusalem,—a fact which did not prevent those who came from Jerusalem from having a great deal of strength in the whole church, for the centre of authority was there. The excitement ran very high. Paul and Barnabas resisted in the most energetic manner. There were long disputes. To put an end to them, it was decided that Paul and Barnabas should go to Jerusalem, in order to come to an understanding with the apostles and elders on this point.

For Paul, this matter possessed a personal importance. His action up to that time had been almost absolutely independent. He had only passed a fortnight at Jerusalem since his conversion, and for eleven years he had not revisited it.³⁷ In the eyes of several he was a sort of heretic, teaching on his own account, and hardly in communion with the rest of the faithful. He declared proudly that he had had his revelation, his gospel. To go to Jerusalem, was, at least in appearance, renouncing his liberty, submitting his gospel to that of the mother church, to learn from others what he knew through a peculiar and personal revelation. He did not deny the rights of the mother church; but he mistrusted them, because he knew the obstinacy of several of her members. He therefore took his precautions not to commit himself too much. He declared that, in going to Jerusalem, he did not yield to any injunction. He even feigned, in accordance with a pretence which was customary with him,³⁸ to be obeying an order from heaven, and to have had a revelation on this

subject.³⁹ He took with him his disciple Titus, who shared all his opinions, and who, as we have said, was not circumcised.⁴⁰

Paul, Barnabas, and Titus set out on their journey. The church of Antioch escorted them on the road to Laodicea on the Sea.⁴¹ They followed the coast of Phenicia, then crossed Samaria, meeting at each step the brethren, and relating to them the wonders of the conversion of the Gentiles. Joy was everywhere. Thus they arrived at Jerusalem. This is one of the most solemn hours in the history of Christianity. The great question is going to be solved. Men on whom the whole future of the new religion is reposing are going to meet face to face. Upon their grandeur of soul, upon their uprightness of heart, depends the future of humanity.

Eighteen years had elapsed since the death of Jesus. The apostles had grown old; one of them had suffered martyrdom; others perhaps were dead. It is known that the deceased members of the apostolic college were not replaced, and that they were allowing the college to become extinct in this manner.

By the side of the apostles had been formed a college of elders, who shared their authority.⁴² The church, looked upon as the depository of the Holy Spirit, was composed of apostles, elders, and the entire brotherhood.⁴³ There were even degrees among the simple brethren.⁴⁴ Inequality was perfectly admissible, but this inequality was entirely moral. There was no question of exterior prerogatives nor material advantages. The three principal "columns," as they were called, of the community, were still Peter, James, brother of the Lord, and John, son of Zebedee.⁴⁵ Several Galileans had disappeared, and had been replaced by a certain number of persons belonging to the party of the Pharisees. "Pharisee" was the synonym of "devotec." Now all these good saints of Jerusalem were also very bigoted. Not having the mind, the *finesse*, the elevation of Jesus, they had fallen after his death into a sort of dull bigotry, like that which their master had so vigorously combated. They were

incapable of irony ; they had almost forgotten the eloquent invectives of Jesus against the hypocrites. Some of them had become species of Jewish talapoins, after the manner of John the Baptist and Banou santons, entirely given up to practices against which Jesus, had he still been living, certainly would not have had sarcasms enough.

James, in particular, surnamed the Just,⁴⁶ or “brother of the Lord,” was one of the most exact observers of the law at that period.⁴⁷ According to certain traditions, in truth very unreliable, he was even an ascetic, practising all the abstinences of the Nazarenes, observing celibacy,⁴⁸ not drinking any intoxicating liquor, abstaining from flesh, never cutting his hair, denying himself ointments and baths, wearing no sandals nor woollen garments, but clothed in plain linen.⁴⁹ Nothing, it will be seen, was more opposed to the ideas of Jesus, who, at least after the death of John the Baptist, had declared this sort of affectation perfectly useless. Abstinences already in favor, in certain branches of Judaism,⁵⁰ became prevalent, and constituted a dominant characteristic of that fraction of the church, which, at a later period was to be joined to a pretended Ebion.⁵¹ The genuine Jews were opposed to these abstinences ;⁵² but the proselytes, above all the women, were much in favor of them.⁵³ James did not leave the temple ; he remained there, it is said, alone, in long hours of prayer, until his knees had become callous and hard, like those of camels. It was believed that he passed his time there after the manner of Jeremiah, in penitence for the people, mourning for the sins of the nation, and praying for her escape from the chastisements which threatened her. It was sufficient for him to raise his hands toward heaven in order to perform miracles.⁵⁴ They had surnamed him the Just, and also *Obliam*, that is to say “bulwark of the people,”⁵⁵ because they supposed that it was his prayers which prevented the Divine wrath from destroying everything.⁵⁶ The Jews, so we are assured, held him in almost the same veneration as the Christians.⁵⁷ If this singular man really was the brother of Jesus, he must have

been, at least, one of those opposition brothers who denied him and wished to arrest him ;⁵⁸ and it is perhaps to such recollections that Paul, angered at so weak a mind, alluded, when he cried out in reference to these columns of the church at Jerusalem, "Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me. God accepteth no man's person."⁵⁹ Jude, brother of James, was, it appears, in entire harmony with his ideas.⁶⁰

In short, the church of Jerusalem had separated more and more from the ideas of Jesus. The leaden weight of Judaism had drawn it along. Jerusalem was an unhealthy centre for the new faith, and in the end would have ruined it. In this capital of Judaism, it was very difficult to cease to be a Jew. Therefore the new men, like St. Paul, almost invariably avoided residing there. Obligated now, under the penalty of a separation from the primitive church, to go and confer with their elders, they found themselves in a very uncomfortable situation, and the work which could only continue to exist through the means of concord and self-denial was placed in great danger.

The interview was in truth singularly constrained and embarrassed.⁶¹ They listened at first with favor to the account which Paul and Barnabas gave of their missions ; for all, even the most Judaizing, were of the opinion that the conversion of the heathen was the great sign of the Messiah.⁶² The curiosity to see the man of whom they had heard so much said, and who had led the sect into so new a path, was at first very rife. They praised God for having made an apostle out of a persecutor.⁶³ But when they reached the circumcision and the obligation to practise the law, the dissension broke out in all its force. The Pharisee party raised claims in the most absolute manner. The party of emancipation made reply with a triumphant energy. There were several cases in which the uncircumcised had received the Holy Spirit. If God made no distinction between heathen and Jew, how could they have the audacity to make it for him ? How could they regard as unclean what God has purified ? Why impose on the neophyte a yoke which the race of Israel

had not been able to bear? It is by Jesus that we are saved, and not by the law.⁶⁴ Paul and Barnabas related in support of this position the miracles that God had performed for the conversion of the Gentiles.⁶⁵ But the Pharisees objected, with no less force, that the law was not abolished; that one never ceased to be a Jew; that the obligations of a Jew remained always the same. They refused to have any connections with Titus, who was uncircumcised. They treated Paul openly as one unfaithful and opposed to the law.

The most admirable feature in the history of the origins of Christianity is that this profound and radical division, bearing upon a matter of the highest importance, should not have produced a complete schism in the church, and one which would have wrought its ruin. The brittle and overstrained mind of Paul had here a formidable opportunity to manifest itself; but his practical good sense, his wisdom, his judgment, was a remedy for everything. The two parties were sprightly, animated, almost severe toward each other. No one renounced his opinion; the question was not solved. They remained united in the common work. A superior tie, the love they all bore Jesus, the remembrance in which they all lived, was stronger than the divisions. The most fundamental dissension which was ever produced in the bosom of the church brought down no anathema, — a great lesson, which ages to come will know but little how to imitate.

Paul saw that he would never succeed in numerous and impassioned assemblies; that the narrow minds would always triumph there; that Judaism was too strong at Jerusalem for any one to hope for a concession in principles from it. He went to see separately all the principal personages; in particular, Peter, James, and John.⁶⁶ Peter, like every man who indulges, above all, in an elevated sentiment, was indifferent to questions of party. These questions pained him. He longed for union, concord, peace. His timid and contracted mind freed itself with difficulty from Judaism. He would have preferred to have the

new converts accept circumcision, but he saw the impossibility of such a solution. Natures thoroughly kind always lack decision : sometimes they even give way to a little dissimulation ; they want to satisfy every one. No question of principle being in their estimation worth the cost of peace, they allow themselves to drift in their connections with the different parties into words and contradictory engagements. Peter committed this slight fault sometimes. To Paul's face he was for the uncircumcised ; but with the strict Jews he became the partisan of circumcision. Paul's soul was so large, so open, so full of the new fire that Jesus had come to bring upon the earth, that Peter could not fail to sympathize with him. They loved each other, and when they were together it was the whole world which these sovereigns of the future shared with each other.

It was doubtless at the termination of one of their conversations that Paul, with the exaggeration of language and dash which were customary with him, said to Peter, "We can agree together ; thou shalt have the gospel of circumcision, and I the gospel of uncircumcision." At a later period, Paul took up this remark as a sort of regular agreement, and one accepted by all the apostles.⁶⁷ It is difficult to believe that Peter and Paul would have dared to repeat words outside of their conversation which would have wounded the feelings of James, and perhaps even of John, most profoundly. But the remark was made. These broad horizons, which were little like those of Jerusalem, greatly moved the enthusiastic soul of Peter. Paul impressed Peter most deeply, and gained him over completely. Up to that time, Peter had travelled but little. His pastoral visits had not assumed a large circuit, it appears, outside of Palestine. He must have been about fifty years old. Paul's passion for travel, the descriptions of his apostolic journeyings, the plans which he communicated to him concerning the future, set his ardor on fire. It is from this date that we see Peter absenting himself from Jerusalem, and leading, in his turn, the wandering life of the apostolate.

James, with his sanctity of so equivocal a style, was the corypheus of the Judaizing party.⁶⁸ It was through him that almost all the conversions among the Pharisees had been made ;⁶⁹ the exigencies of this party⁷⁰ were met by him. Everything leads us to believe that he made no concession in regard to dogmatic principle ;⁷¹ but a moderate and conciliatory spirit soon began to be evident. They admitted the genuineness of the heathen conversions ; they declared that it was useless to trouble them in regard to circumcision ; that it was only necessary to maintain a few ordinances touching morality, or those of which the suppression would have shocked the Jews too greatly.⁷² In order to reassure the party of the Pharisees, they asserted that the existence of the law was not on that account jeopardized ; that Moses had had from time immemorial, and always would have, those to read his word in the synagogues.⁷³ In this way the converted Jews remained faithful to the law, and the exemption only had reference to the converted heathen.⁷⁴ In practice, moreover, they were to avoid offending those who had stricter views. It was probably the moderate minds, authors of this rather contradictory transaction,⁷⁵ who advised Paul to persuade Titus to have himself circumcised. Titus, in reality, had become one of the chief difficulties of the situation. The Pharisean converts of Jerusalem willingly supported the fact that very far from them, at Antioch, or in the depth of Asia Minor, there were uncircumcised Christians. But to see them in Jerusalem, to be obliged to associate with them, and thus commit a flagrant violation of that law to which they clung, body and soul, that was something to which they did not resign themselves.

Paul received such a demand with a great many precautions. He was well convinced that it was not through necessity that they asked for the circumcision of Titus ; that Titus would remain a Christian even should he not undergo this ceremony, but that they asked it as a mark of condescension for the brethren whose consciences were interested, and who otherwise could

not have any connections with him. Paul consented, not without some hard words against the authors of such an exigency; against "those intruders who had only entered the church to diminish the number of liberties created by Jesus."⁷⁶ He protested that in nothing would he submit his opinion to theirs; that the concession which he made was only for this time alone, and in consideration of the good resulting from peace. With such reservations he gave his consent, and Titus was circumcised. This action cost Paul a great deal, and the sentence in which he speaks of it is one of the most original that he ever wrote. The sentence at first glance appears to say that Titus was not circumcised, while it implies that he was.⁷⁷ The painful recollection of this moment often recurs to him. This apparent return to Judaism seemed to him at times like a denial of Jesus. He reassured himself by saying, "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews."⁷⁸ Like all men who hold strongly to ideas, Paul cared little for forms. He saw the vanity of everything which does not proceed from the soul, and when the supreme interests of conscience were at stake, he, usually so inflexible, abandoned everything else.⁷⁹

The very important concession implied by the circumcision of Titus overcame much of the ill-will. They allowed that in distant countries, where the newly converted had no daily intercourse with the Jews, it would be sufficient if they abstained from blood as well as from meats offered in sacrifice to the gods, or strangled, and that they observed the same laws as the Jews in respect to marriage and the relations of the two sexes.⁸⁰ The use of the flesh of swine, the forbidding of which was everywhere the sign of Judaism, was left free. It was about the *ensemble* of *Noachian* precepts; that is to say, those supposed to have been revealed to Noah, and which were imposed upon all the proselytes.⁸¹ The idea that life is in the blood, and that blood is the soul itself, inspired the Jews with an extreme horror for meats which had not been bled. To abstain therefrom was for them a precept of natural religion.⁸² They supposed

demons to be particularly greedy of blood, so that in eating meat that had not been bled there was a risk of swallowing a demon.⁸³ A man who about this period wrote, under the assumed name of the celebrated Greek moralist, Phocylides, a petty course of Jewish natural morality, simplified for the use of non-Jews,⁸⁴ gave attention to analogous solutions. This honest abricator in no wise strives to convert his reader to Judaism. He merely seeks to inculcate in him the "Noachian precepts," and a few quite modified Jewish revelations concerning meats and marriage. The first of these rules are reduced by him to prescriptions concerning hygiene and alimentary fitness, — to the abstaining from repulsive or unhealthy things. The second relate to the regularity and purity of sexual intercourse.⁸⁵ The entire remainder of the Jewish ritual is reduced to nothing.

To conclude, the results of the convention at Jerusalem were only agreed to *visa voce*, and not even drawn up in a very strict manner, for we shall frequently see them disregarded.⁸⁶ The idea of dogmatic regulations emanating from a council had not as yet suggested itself. With a profound good sense, these simple people attained the highest degree of political expediency. They saw that the only possibility of escaping great questions is not to solve them; to take half-way measures, which satisfy no one; and to allow the questions to use themselves up and die from lack of claim to existence.

They separated, satisfied. Paul set forth to Peter, James, and John, the gospel that he was preaching to the Gentiles. They approved it completely; found nothing reprehensible in it, and did not undertake to add anything to it.⁸⁷ They took Paul and Barnabas openly by the hand; they admitted their immediate divine right to the apostolate of the heathen world; they ascribed to them a sort of peculiar grace for those who were the special object of their vocation. The title of Apostle of the Gentiles, which St. Paul had already assumed, was, as he assures us,⁸⁸ officially confirmed in him. And, without a doubt, they accorded him, at least by tacit consent, the claim he valued the most,

namely, that he had had his special revelation as directly as those who had seen Jesus; in other words, that his vision on the road to Damascus equalled the other apparitions of the resurrected Christ. In return, they only asked the three representatives of the church of Antioch not to forget the poor of Jerusalem. In truth, the church of this city, by consequence of its communistic organization, its peculiar duties, and the wretchedness which existed in Judea, continued to remain at bay. Paul and his party accepted this proposition with eagerness. They hoped, by a sort of contribution, to silence the intolerant Hierosolymitic party, and to reconcile it to the idea of there being Gentile churches. By means of a slight tribute, they purchased freedom of thought, and remained in communication with the central church, outside of which they did not dare to hope for safety.⁸⁹

In order that no doubt should remain in regard to reconciliation, they desired that Paul, Barnabas, and Titus, in returning to Antioch, should be accompanied by two of the principal members of the church of Jerusalem. Judas Bar-Sabas, and Silvanus, or Silas, were commissioned to disown the brethren of Judea, who had created trouble in the church of Antioch, and to give testimony to Paul and Barnabas, whose services and devotion they recognized. The joy at Antioch was very great. Judas and Silas were regarded as prophets. Their inspired words were extremely acceptable to the church of Antioch. Silas was so well pleased in this atmosphere of life and liberty that he did not wish to return to Jerusalem. Judas returned alone to the apostles, and Silas attached himself to Paul by ties of brotherhood drawn closer every day.⁹⁰

CHAPTER IV.

SECRET PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY. — ITS INTRODUCTION INTO ROME.

ONE idea of which it is necessary to rid one's self when the propagation of Christianity is under consideration, is, that this propagation was brought about by means of uninterrupted missions, and the efforts of preachers similar to the missionaries of modern times, whose business was to go from city to city. Paul, Barnabas, and their companions, were the only ones who sometimes proceeded in this manner. The rest was wrought by those whose names have remained unknown. At the side of those apostles who attained celebrity, there existed in this manner another and obscure apostolate, whose agents were not dogmatists by profession, but who were on that account only the more efficacious. The Jews of this period were extremely nomadic. Merchants, servants, petty artisans, frequented all the large cities on the coast, exercising their callings. Active, laborious and honest,¹ they carried their ideas, their good examples, and their confidence with them, and towered above these inhabitants, debased in matters of religion, with all the superiority of the enthusiast over the indifferent. The affiliated of the Christian sect travelled like the other Jews, and bore the good tidings along with them. It was a sort of confidential preaching, and much more persuasive than any other. The mildness, the gayety, the good-humor, and the patience of the new believers,² made them welcome everywhere, and won hearts for them.

Rome was one of the first points reached in this manner. The capital of the empire heard the name of Jesus long before the intermediate countries had been evangelized, just as a mountain-top is lighted up when the valleys situated between it

and the sun are still enveloped in darkness. In fact, Rome was the rendezvous of all oriental religions,³ the point on the Mediterranean with which the Syrians had most connections. They arrived there in enormous hordes. Like all poor people rushing to the assault of large cities, to which they go to seek fortune, they were diligent and submissive. With them landed bands of Greeks, Asiatics, Egyptians, all speaking Greek. Rome was literally a bilingual city.⁴ The language of the Jewish world and of the Christian world in Rome was for three centuries Greek.⁵ At Rome, Greek was the language of everything most wicked and most upright, best and worst. Rhetoricians, grammarians, philosophers, worthy pedagogues, teachers, servants, intriguers, artists, singers, dancers, brokers, and artisans, preachers of new sects, religious heroes,—all these people spoke Greek. The old Roman *bourgeoisie* was losing ground each day, overwhelmed as it was by this tide of strangers.

It is extremely probable that as early as the year, 50 a few Syrian Jews, converted to Christianity, entered the capital of the empire, and spread their ideas there. In fact, among the good administrative measures of Claudius, Suetonius includes the following: "He cleared Rome of Jews who frequently caused disturbances, at the instigation of one Chrestus."⁶ Of course it is possible that Rome may have contained a Jew by the name of Chrestus,⁷ who caused trouble among his co-religionists, and brought about their expulsion. But it is far more probable⁸ that this name of Chrestus is no other than the name of Christ himself.⁹ The introduction of the new faith doubtless gave rise in the Jewish district of Rome to disputes, quarrels, in short to scenes similar to those which had taken place at Damascus, Antioch of Pisidia, and Lystra. Wishing to put an end to these disorders, the police may have issued a warrant for the expulsion of these peace disturbers. The chiefs of police probably only superficially investigated the cause of the disturbance, a matter of little interest to them, and a report addressed to the government may have stated that the rioters were called *christiani*,¹⁰

that is to say, partisans of one *Christus*. This name being unknown, it may have been changed into *Chrestus*, in consequence of the habit of slightly educated persons to give foreign names a form appropriate to their customs.¹¹ Hence, to arrive at the conclusion that there was a man by this name who had been the instigator and the leader of these disturbances¹² was but a single step to take. The inspectors of police took it, and without any further investigation they pronounced the banishment of both parties.¹³

The principal Jewish quarter of Rome was situated on the other side of the Tiber ;¹⁴ that is to say, in the poorest and dirtiest portion of the city,¹⁵ probably in the neighborhood of the present *porta Portese*.¹⁶ There was formerly located, as in our day, the port of Rome,—the place where merchandise brought from Ostia, in flat-boats, was landed. It was a district of Jews and Syrians, “nations born for servitude,” as Cicero says.¹⁷ The first nucleus of the Jewish population of Rome had in fact been composed of freedmen,¹⁸ principally descended from those whom Pompey brought as prisoners to Rome. They had passed through slavery without the least change in their religious habits.¹⁹ An admirable point about Judaism is this simplicity of faith, a result of which is, that the Jew transported a thousand leagues from his country, after the lapse of several generations, is still the same genuine Jew. The connections of the synagogues of Rome with Jerusalem were uninterrupted.²⁰ The first colony had been reinforced by numerous emigrants.²¹ These poor people embarked by hundreds at the *Ripa*, and lived among themselves, in the district adjoining the Transtevere, serving as porters, petty dealers, exchanging matches for broken glass, and presenting the proud Italian population a type which was later destined to become too familiar to them—that of the beggar, master in his art.²² A Roman who respected himself never entered these abject districts. It was like a precinct sacrificed to the despised classes and to infectious purposes. The tanneries and fermenting troughs were located there.²³ Therefore these wretched people

lived quite peaceably in this abandoned corner, in the midst of bales of merchandise, low public houses, and the litter-carriers "Syri," who had their headquarters there.²⁴ The police only entered there when the disturbances were bloody, or took place too frequently. Few districts of Rome were so free; politics had nothing to seek there. In ordinary times, the religion was not only practised there without obstacle, but propaganda was made there with every facility.²⁵

Protected by the disdain which they inspired, slightly sensible moreover to the railleries of the outside world, the Jews of the Transtevere thus led a religious and very active social life. They possessed schools of *hakamim*; ²⁶ nowhere was the ritualistic and ceremonial part of the law more scrupulously observed, ²⁷ the synagogues presented the most complete organization known. ²⁸ The titles of "father and mother of the synagogue" ²⁹ were highly prized. Rich female converts assumed biblical names; they likewise converted their slaves, had the Scriptures explained to them by the doctors, constructed places for prayer, and showed themselves proud of the consideration that they enjoyed in this little world. ³⁰ The poor Jewess seized an opportunity while begging with a trembling voice to whisper a few words of the law into the ear of the high Roman lady, and often gained over the matron who extended her hand to her full of small pieces of money. ³¹ To keep the Sabbath and the Jewish festivities is for Horace the characteristic which classes a man among the weak minds, that is to say, the multitude, *unus multorum*. ³² Universal kindness, happiness of reposing with the just, helping the poor, purity of morals, sweetness of family life, mild acceptance of death, considered as a sleep, are sentiments which recur in Jewish inscriptions with that peculiar accent of touching grace, humility, and certain hope which characterizes Christian inscriptions. ³³ There were very many Jewish men of the world, rich and powerful, such as that Tiberias Alexander, who reached the highest honors of the Empire, exercised twice or three times an influence of the first order upon public affairs,

and even had, to the great chagrin of the Romans, a statue in the Forum ;³⁴ but such ones were no longer Jews. The Herods, although practising their religion at Rome with ostentation,³⁵ were far—through their relations with the heathen alone—from being true Israelites. The poor but faithful ones regarded these worldly men as renegades ; just as we in our day see the Polish or Hungarian Jews treating with severity the French Israelites occupying high positions, who abandon the synagogue and bring their children up in Protestantism, in order to remove them from too restricted a circle.

A world of ideas was thus agitating itself on the common wharf, where the merchandise of the whole world was piled up ; but all this was lost in the tumult of a great city of the size of London or Paris.³⁶ Of a truth, the haughty patricians who, in their promenades on the Aventine, cast their eyes across the Tiber, did not imagine that the future was getting itself ready in this pile of wretched houses at the foot of the Janiculum.³⁷ On that day of the reign of Claudius on which some Jews initiated into the new creed set foot on land opposite the *emporium*,—on that day, no one knew in Rome that the founder of a second empire, another Romulus, was lodged at the port, on his bed of straw.³⁸ Near the port there was a sort of lodgings, well known to the people and soldiers, under the name of *Taberna meritoria*. In order to attract the bumpkins, a pretended oil-spring, issuing from a rock, was shown here. At a very early date, this oil-spring was regarded by the Christians as symbolical. They pretended that its appearance had coincided with the birth of Jesus.³⁹ It appears that later they transformed the *Taberna* into a church.⁴⁰ Who knows whether the most ancient recollections of Christianity are not attached to this inn? Under Alexander Severus, we see the Christians and inn-keepers disputing for a certain place which formerly had been public, and which this good emperor caused to be adjudged to the Christians.⁴¹ We feel that this is the native soil of an old popular Christianity. Claudius, about this time struck with the “pro-

gress of foreign superstitions," had believed himself to be doing an act of good conservative policy by re-establishing the Aruspices. In a report made to the Senate, he complained of the indifference of the times in respect to the ancient usages of Italy, and the good systems of discipline. The Senate had invited the pontiffs to see which ones of these old practices could be re-established. Consequently everything went well, and they believed these respectable frauds to be eternally safe.

The great affair of the moment was the coming of Agrippina to power, the adoption of Nero by Claudius, and his ever increasing fortune. No one thought of the poor Jew who pronounced the name of Christ for the first time in the Syrian colony, and communicated to his room-mates the faith which made him happy. Others soon arrived. Letters from Syria, brought by the new-comers, spoke of the ever-increasing movement. A little group was formed. Every one smelt of garlic.⁴² These ancestors of Roman prelates were poor proletaires, dirty, all alike clownish, clothed in filthy gabardines, having the bad breath of people who live badly.⁴³ Their retreats breathed that odor of wretchedness exhaled by persons meanly clothed and fed, and collected in a small room.⁴⁴ They were soon numerous enough to speak loud. They preached in the *ghetto*; the orthodox Jews resisted. That tumultuous scenes should have taken place; that these scenes should have been renewed several nights in succession; that the Roman police should have interfered, and that, caring very little to know what the trouble was, they should have addressed a report to the superior authority, and laid the disturbances at the door of one Chrestus, whom they had not been able to arrest; that the expulsion of the rioters should have been decided upon, — there is nothing in all this but what is very plausible. The passage from Suetonius, and still more that from the *Acts*, would appear to imply that all the Jews were driven out on this occasion; but that is not to be supposed. It is probable that the Christians, the partisans of the seditious Chrestus, were alone

driven out. Claudius in general favored the Jews, and it is not even impossible that the expulsion of the Christians, of which we have just been speaking, may have taken place at the instigation of the Jews, — of the Herods, for instance. These expulsions, moreover, were never more than temporary and conditional.⁴⁵ The tide, checked for a moment, still flowed on.⁴⁶ The proceeding of Claudius was, at any rate, of little consequence; for Josephus does not speak of it, and, in the year 58, Rome already had a new Christian church.⁴⁷

The founders of this first Church of Rome, destroyed by decree of Claudius, are unknown. But we know the names of two Jews who were exiled in consequence of the disturbances at the *porta Portese*. They were a pious couple, composed of Aquila, a Jew, originally from Pontus, professing the same trade as St. Paul, that of tent-maker,⁴⁸ and Priscilla, his wife. They took refuge at Corinth, where we shall soon see them with St. Paul, of whom they become the intimate friends and zealous collaborators. Aquila and Priscilla are thus the two earliest members of the Church of Rome known to us.⁴⁹ They are scarcely recollected by her.⁵⁰ Legendary record, always unjust, for it is always influenced by political motives, has excluded these two obscure artisans from the Christian pantheon, in order to attribute the honor of founding the Church of Rome to a more illustrious name, more befitting the haughty pretensions to universal domination, which the capital of the Empire, when it had become Christianized, could not surrender. In our mind, it is not at the theatrical Basilica which they have consecrated to St. Peter; it is at the *porta Portese*, that antique *ghetto*, that we in reality see the starting-point of western Christianity. It should be the footsteps of these poor Jewish vagrants, who brought the religion of the world with them, — of these men of suffering, dreaming in their misery of the kingdom of God, that they should seek out and kiss. We do not dispute Rome her essential title. Rome was probably the first point in the western world, and even of Europe, where Christianity estab-

lished itself. But instead of these lofty Basilicas, instead of these insulting devices, *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat*, it would be better to rear a modest chapel to the two good Jews from Pontus who were driven out by the police of Claudius for having belonged to the party of Chrestus!

Next to the Church of Rome, — if it was not in reality first, — the most ancient church of the west was that of Puteoli. St. Paul finds Christians there towards the year 61.⁵¹ Puteoli was, to some extent, the port of Rome; ⁵² it was, at least, the landing-place of the Jews and Syrians on their way to Rome.⁵³ This strange soil, undermined by fire, these Phlegrean fields, this solfatara, these caverns full of burning vapor, which seemed like the air-holes of hell, these sulphurous waters, these myths of giants and demons, buried in valleys of fire, *gehenné*, as it were,⁵⁴ these baths, which appeared to the austere Jews — enemies of all nudity — the very height of abomination, deeply impressed the lively imaginations of the new-comers, and have left a profound trace in the Apocalyptic compositions of the period.⁵⁵ The follies of Caligula,⁵⁶ marks of which are to be seen, also caused fearful recollections to hover over these places.

One principal feature, at any rate, and one which it behooves us to mention already, is that the Church of Rome was not, like the churches of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, an establishment of the school of Paul. It was a creation of the Jewish Christians, directly attached to the Church of Jerusalem.⁵⁷ In it, Paul will never be on his own ground. He will perceive in this great church many weaknesses which he will treat with indulgence, but which will wound his exalted idealism.⁵⁸ Attached to circumcision and outward practices,⁵⁹ Ebionite⁶⁰ in its taste for abstinences,⁶¹ and in his doctrine rather Jewish than Christian, concerning the person and death of Jesus,⁶² strongly attached to millenarianism,⁶³ the Roman church presents from its early days essential features which will distinguish it in its long and wonderful history. Direct offspring of Jerusalem, the Roman Church will always have an ascetic, sacerdotal character,

opposed to the Protestant tendency of Paul. Peter will be its veritable chief. Then, with the political and hierarchical spirit of old heathen Rome penetrating it, it will truly become the New Jerusalem; the city of the Pontificate, of the hieratic and solemn religion, of material sacraments which are self-justifying; the city of ascetics after the manner of James *Obliam*, with his callous knees and the blade of gold on his forehead. It will be the church of authority. If we consult it, the only sign of the apostolic mission will be to show a letter signed by the apostles, to produce a certificate of orthodoxy.⁶⁴ The good and the evil done by the Church of Jerusalem to growing Christianity will be done to the church universal, by the Church of Rome. In vain will St. Paul address her his beautiful epistle, to explain to her the mystery of the cross of Jesus, and of safety through faith alone. This epistle will be but slightly understood by the Church of Rome. But Luther, fourteen centuries and a half later, will understand it, and will open a new era in the secular series of the alternative triumphs of Peter and Paul.

CHAPTER V.

SECOND JOURNEY OF ST. PAUL.—ANOTHER SOJOURN IN GALATIA.

No sooner had Paul returned to Antioch than he set about forming new plans. His ardent soul could not bear repose. On the one hand, he thought of enlarging the rather contracted sphere of his first mission; on the other hand, his revisiting his loved churches of Galatia, in order to confirm them in the faith,¹ occupied his mind incessantly. The tenderness of which this strange nature appeared in some respects to be destitute, had transformed itself into a powerful faculty of loving the communities which he had established. He had for his churches the feelings which other men have for that which they love the most.² This was a special gift of the Jews. The spirit of association possessed by them in over-abundance, caused them to give entirely new applications to the idea of family. The synagogue, the church, were then what the convent was to be in the middle ages,—the loved house, the home of great affections, the roof that shelters what we hold most dear. Paul communicated his design to Barnabas. But the friendship of the two apostles, which, up to that time, had resisted the strongest trials, that no susceptibility of self-love, no caprice of character, had been able to diminish, received this time a cruel blow. Barnabas proposed to Paul to take John-Mark with them. Paul was angered. He had not pardoned John-Mark for having abandoned the first mission at Perga, at the moment in which it was entering upon the most perilous portion of the voyage. The man who had once refused to enter upon the work appeared to him unworthy of being enrolled again. Barnabas defended his cousin, whose intentions probably Paul in reality judged with too much severity. The quarrel assumed considerable

liveliness. It was impossible to come to an understanding.³ This old friendship, which had been the result of the evangelical preaching, yielded for a time to an insignificant question of persons. The truth is, we are allowed to suppose that the rupture had profounder reasons. It is miraculous that Paul's ever increasing pretensions, his pride, his need of being absolute chief, should not have already twenty times destroyed the connections of two men whose reciprocal situation was entirely changed. Barnabas had not Paul's genius, but who can say whether in the true hierarchy of souls, which is regulated by the degree of goodness, he would not occupy a more elevated rank? When we recall what Barnabas had been to Paul; when we think that it was he who at Jerusalem silenced the rather well-founded distrust of which the new convert was the object; who went to Tarsus for the future apostle, still isolated and undecided as to his course; who introduced him into the young and active world of Antioch; who, in a word, made him an apostle; we cannot prevent ourselves from seeing in this rupture, based upon a motive of secondary importance, a great act of ingratitude on the part of Paul. But the exigencies of his work were pressing hard upon him. Who is the man of action that once in his life has not committed a great error of heart?

The two apostles, therefore, separated. Barnabas, with John-Mark, embarked at Seleucia for Cyprus.⁴ Henceforth, history loses sight of his itinerary. While Paul is marching on to glory, his companion, obscure the moment he left the side of him who lighted him up with his rays, wears himself out in the labors of an unknown apostolate. The enormous injustice which often rules the affairs of this world, presides over history as over all the rest. Those who take the rôles of devotion and mildness are generally forgotten. The author of the Acts, with his frank policy of conciliation, has, without wishing it, sacrificed Barnabas to the desire that he had of reconciling Peter and Paul. Through a sort of instinctive need of amends, diminishing and subordinating Paul on the one hand, he magnified him on the

other, at the expense of a modest collaborator who had no particular rôle, and who did not weigh upon history with the iniquitous weight which results from the arrangement of parties. Hence arises the ignorance in which we are concerning the apostolate of Barnabas. We merely know that this apostolate continued to be active. Barnabas remained true to the great principles which he and Paul had established in their first mission. He took no companion in his wanderings; he always lived by his own labor, accepting nothing from the churches.⁵ He will meet Paul again at Antioch. The haughty disposition of Paul will again give rise to more than one dissension between them,⁶ but the feeling for the holy work will prevail over all; the connection between the two apostles will remain entire. Each one working on his side, they will remain in correspondence with each other, asking information mutually concerning their labors.⁷ In spite of the great dissensions, Paul will continue to treat Barnabas as a colleague, and to consider him as sharing with him in the work of the Gentile apostolate.⁸ Quick, passionate, susceptible, Paul soon forgot, when the great principles to which he devoted his life were not in question.

In place of Barnabas, Paul took for a companion, Silas, the prophet of the church of Jerusalem, who had remained at Antioch. He did not regret, in default of John-Mark, having with him another member of the church of Jerusalem, one who was apparently related to Peter.⁹ Silas possessed, it is said, the title of Roman citizen,¹⁰ a fact which, in conjunction with his name of Silvanus, would lead us to believe that he was not from Judea; or, that he had had occasion to familiarize himself with the heathen world. Both set out recommended by the brethren to the grace of God. Forms were not empty then. They believed that the finger of God was everywhere, that every step of the apostles of the new kingdom was directed by the immediate inspiration of heaven.

Paul and Silas made the journey by land.¹¹ Inclining toward the north, through the plains of Antioch, they crossed the de-

file of the Amanus and the "Syrian Gates";¹² then skirting the interior shores of the Gulf of Issus, and crossing the northern branch of the Amanus by the "Gates of Amanides,"¹³ they traversed Cilicia; passed probably by way of Tarsus; crossed the Taurus without doubt by the celebrated "Cilician Gates,"¹⁴ one of the most frightful mountain passes in the world; penetrated thus into Lycaonia, and reached Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium. Paul found his loved churches in the state in which he had left them. The faithful had persevered; their number had increased. Timothy, who was only a child at the period of his first journey, had become an excellent subject. His youth, his piety, and his intelligence pleased Paul. All the faithful ones of Lycaonia gave him the best character. Paul became attached to him, loved him tenderly, and always found a zealous collaborator in him,¹⁵ or rather a son ('tis Paul himself who uses this expression.)¹⁶ Timothy was a man of great candor, modest and timid.¹⁷ He had not sufficient confidence to face great responsibilities. He lacked authority, above all in Greek countries, where the minds were trifling and light;¹⁸ but his self-denial made him a deacon and secretary, invaluable for Paul. Therefore Paul declares that he has no other disciple so completely after his own heart.¹⁹ Impartial history is forced to take, for the profit of Timothy and Barnabas, some of the glory engrossed by the too absorbing personality of Paul.

Paul, in attaching himself to Timothy, foresaw grave embarrassments. He feared that, in his connection with the Jews, the fact of Timothy's not being circumcised might be a cause of repulsion and trouble. In fact, it was everywhere known that his father was a heathen. A number of timorous persons might not wish to have any connection with him. The quarrels which the interview at Jerusalem had scarcely settled, might break out again. Paul recollected the difficulties he had experienced with regard to Titus. He resolved to prevent them, and in order to avoid being obliged at a later period to make a concession to principles which he rejected, he circumcised Timothy²⁰ himself.

This was in conformity with the principles which guided him in the affair of Titus,²¹ and which he still professed.²² They could never have influenced him to acknowledge that circumcision was necessary, in order to be saved. In his opinion this was an error in faith. But circumcision not being a bad thing, he thought that it might be practised in order to avoid scandal and schism. His great rule was that the apostle should be all things to all men, and bend to the prejudices of those whom he wishes to gain over, when these prejudices are of themselves frivolous and in no wise reprehensible. But, at the same time, as if he had a presentiment of the trials which the faith of the Galatians would have to suffer, he made them promise never to listen to any other doctor excepting himself, and to reject as accursed every other teaching but his.²³

From Iconium Paul probably went to Antioch of Pisidia,²⁴ and thus finished visiting the principal churches of Galatia, established at the time of his first journey. He then resolved²⁵ to visit new lands, but great hesitation took possession of him. The thought of attempting the west of Asia Minor, that is to say, the province of Asia,²⁶ suggested itself to his mind. There was most life in this part of Asia Minor. Ephesus was the capital of it. Here were situated those beautiful and flourishing cities of Smyrna, Pergamos, Magnesia, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Colossæ, Laodicea, Hierapolis, Tralles, and Miletus, where Christianity was about to establish its centre. We are ignorant of what dissuaded St. Paul from carrying his efforts in this direction. "The Holy Spirit," says the narrator of the Acts, "prevented him from preaching in Asia." It must be borne in mind that the apostles, in regard to the direction of their courses, were supposed to obey inspirations from above. At times there were real motives, reflections, or positive indications, disguised in this form of language; at others, there was an absence of motives. The opinion that God divulges his will to man through the medium of dreams was widely spread,²⁷ as it is still in our day, throughout the Orient. A dream, a sudden impulsion, an

unreflected movement, unexplained noise (*bathkôl*),²⁸ appeared to them to be manifestations of the Spirit, and decided the direction of the preaching.²⁹ Certain it is, however, that from Antioch of Pisidia, instead of directing their steps towards the brilliant provinces of the south-west of Asia Minor, Paul and his companions penetrated more and more towards the centre of the Peninsula, formed of provinces much less celebrated and less civilized. They crossed Phrygia Epictetus,³⁰ probably passing by way of the cities of Synnades and *Æzanes*, and reached the confines of Mysia. Here their indecision recommenced. Should they turn northward towards Bithynia, or should they continue towards the west and enter Mysia? They endeavored at first to enter Bithynia, but untoward incidents took place which they regarded as indications of the will of heaven. They imagined that the spirit of Jesus did not wish them to enter this latter country.³¹ They therefore crossed Mysia, from one end to another, and arrived at Alexandria Troas,³² a considerable port, situated almost opposite Tenedos, and not far from the site of ancient Troy. The apostolic group thus made almost in a single trip a journey of more than one hundred leagues, across a country which, from an absence of Roman colonies and Jewish synagogues, did not offer them any of the facilities which they had met with up to that period.

These long journeys in Asia Minor, full of pleasant *ennuis* and of dreamy mystery, are a singular medley of sadness and charm. Frequently the route is rude. Certain districts are singularly rough and bare. Other portions, on the contrary, are full of freshness, and in no wise correspond to the ideas that one is accustomed to attach to that vague word Orient.

The mouth of the Orontes draws, in respect to nature as well as with regard to races, a profound line of demarcation. Asia Minor, from the aspect and tone of the landscape, reminds us of Italy, or our south as high up as Valence and Avignon. The European is nowise out of his latitude, as in Syria and Egypt. It is, if I may presume to express it so, an Aryan and not a

Semitic country, and it is not improbable that it may some day be occupied again by the Indo-European race (Greeks and Armenians). Water is abundant there: the cities are inundated with it. Certain points, such as Nymphi, Magnesia of the Sipylus, are truly paradise-like. The terraced plan of the mountains, which shut in the horizon on all sides, presents varieties of infinite forms, and at times fantastic shapes which one would consider imaginary, if the artist dared to imitate them; summits toothed like a saw, torn and creased sides, strange cones, and perpendicular walls, where the beauties of the stone display themselves with brilliancy. Thanks to these numerous chains of mountains, the waters are running and sparkling. Long rows of poplars, little plane-trees in the broad beds of the winter torrents, and splendid clusters of trees, the feet of which plunge into the springs, while the dark tufts project from the base of every mountain, are the consolation of the traveller. At every spring the caravan halts and drinks. Walking day after day on these narrow lines³³ of ancient pavements, which for centuries have borne such different travellers, is at times fatiguing, but the halts are delicious. An hour's repose, a piece of bread eaten on the borders of these limpid streams coursing over pebbly beds, sustain you for a long while.

At Troas, Paul, who in this part of his journey does not appear to have followed any very fixed plan, fell into new uncertainty as to the route which he should choose. Macedonia appeared to promise him a fine harvest. It would seem that he was confirmed in this idea by a Macedonian whom he met at Troas. He was a physician, an uncircumcised proselyte,³⁴ by the name of Lucanus or Lucas.³⁵ This Latin name would lead us to believe that the new disciple belonged to the Roman colony at Philippi.³⁶ His rare knowledge in respect to nautical geography and navigation, would, nevertheless, rather lead us to think that he was from Neapolis. The ports, and all the coast of the Mediterranean, appear to have been remarkably familiar to him.

This man, for whom was reserved so important a rôle in the

history of Christianity, as he was destined to be the historian of the Origins of Christianity, and his judgments were, by imposing themselves upon the future, to regulate the ideas to be formed concerning the early days of the church, had received a rather careful Jewish and Hellenic education. His disposition was mild and conciliating, his soul tender and sympathetic, his character modest and given to self-denial. Paul loved him much; and Luke, on his part, was always faithful to his master.³⁷ Like Timothy, Luke seemed to have been created expressly to be the companion of Paul.³⁸ Blind submission and confidence, boundless admiration, inclination to obedience, and unreserved devotion, were his habitual characteristics. We might say, that it was even then a specimen of that absolute abdication of self existing in the Irish monk, when in the hands of his abbey.³⁹ The idea of the "disciple" was never so perfectly realized. Luke is in reality fascinated by the ascendancy of Paul. His good-nature, as man of the people, displays itself continually; his imagination always pictures to him, as model of perfection and happiness, that honest man, the real master in his family, of which he resembles the spiritual father; a Jew at heart, accepting the faith with his whole house.⁴⁰ He liked the Roman officers, and willingly believed them virtuous. One of the things he admires most is a good centurion,—pious, kind to the Jews, well served, and well obeyed.⁴¹ He had probably studied the Roman army at Philippi, and was impressed by it. He naively supposed that discipline and hierarchy are things of moral order. His esteem for the Roman functionaries is also great.⁴² His title of physician⁴³ implies that he had learning, a fact proved by his writings; but does not imply a scientific and rational culture, which few physicians then possessed.

What Luke is, pre-eminently, is "the man of good-will," the true Israelite at heart, one to whom Jesus brings peace. It is he who has transmitted to us and who probably composed those delicious canticles of the birth and infancy of Jesus, those angel hymns of Mary, of Zacharias, of the old Simeon, in which burst

forth in sounds so clear and so joyful the happiness of the new alliance, the *hosanna* of the pious proselyte, the re-established concord between the fathers and the sons in the increased family of Israel.⁴⁴

Everything leads us to believe that Luke was moved by the Divine grace at Troas; that he immediately attached himself to Paul, and persuaded him that he would find an excellent field in Macedonia. His words made a great impression on the apostle. The latter thought he saw, in a dream, a Macedonian standing and inviting him, saying, "Come over and help us." It was reported in the apostolic troupe that God had ordered them to go into Macedonia, and that they should only wait for a favorable occasion to set out.⁴⁵

CHAPTER VI.

CONTINUATION OF THE SECOND JOURNEY OF ST. PAUL. — MISSION OF MACEDONIA.

HERE the mission landed upon entirely new countries. It was what they called the province of Macedonia. But these countries had only formed part of the Macedonian kingdom since Philip. They were in reality parts of Thrace, anciently colonized by the Greeks, then absorbed by the strong monarchy, the centre of which was at Pella, and since two hundred years a portion of the great Roman unity. Few countries in the world were purer in regard to race than these countries, situated between the Hæmus and the Mediterranean. Different branches, in truth, but very authentic ones, of the Indo-European family were here superimposed upon one another. If we except a few Phenician influences coming from Thasos and Samothrace, almost nothing foreign had penetrated into the interior. Thrace, in a great portion Celtic,¹ had remained faithful to Aryan life. It kept its ancient religions under a form which appeared barbarous to the Greeks and Romans, but which in reality was only primitive. As to Macedonia, it was perhaps the most honest, most earnest, most healthy region of the ancient world. It was originally a country of feudal burgs, not of large, independent cities. Now, this is of all systems the one which preserves human morality the best, and reserves the most strength for the future. Monarchical, through solidity of spirit and self-denial, full of antipathy for the charlatanism and often sterile agitation of the petty republics, the Macedonians offered Greece a type of society similar to that of the middle ages, founded upon *loyalism*, upon faith in legitimacy and hereditary rights, and upon the spirit of conservatism, equally far removed from the ignominious despotism of the Orient and of this demo-

cratic fever which, burning the blood of the people, so quickly consumes those who abandon themselves to it. Thus, freed from the causes of social corruption, which democracy almost always brings along with it, and, nevertheless, free from the iron chains which Sparta had invented to fortify herself against revolution, the Macedonians were that people of antiquity who most resembled the Romans. They remind one, in some respects, of the German barons, — brave, drunken, rude, proud, and faithful. If they only realized for a moment what the Romans knew how to establish in a durable manner, they at least had the honor of surviving their attempt. The little kingdom of Macedonia, without factions or seditions, with a good internal administration, was the most stable nationality which the Romans had to combat against in the Orient. A strong patriotic and legitimistic spirit reigned there to such a degree, that, after their defeats, the inhabitants were seen to take fire with a wonderful facility for impostors pretending to continue their ancient dynasty.

Under the Romans, Macedonia remained a worthy and pure land. She furnished Brutus two excellent legions.² One did not see the Macedonians, like the Syrians, Egyptians, and Asiatics, hasten to Rome to enrich themselves on the fruits of their bad practices. In spite of the terrible substitutions of races which took place,³ it may be said that Macedonia has still preserved the same character. It is a country placed in the normal conditions of European life, wooded, fertile, watered by large streams, having internal sources of riches; while Greece, meagre, poor, singular in everything, has only its glory and its beauty. A land of miracles, like Judea and Sinai, Greece has flourished once; but it is not susceptible of flourishing again. It has created something unique, which it were impossible to renew. It appears that when God shows himself in a country, He dries it up forever. A land of klephtes and artists, Greece has no longer any original *rôle* on that day on which the world enters upon the path of riches, industry, and ample perfection.

She only produced genius ; and one is astonished, in going over it, that a powerful race should have been able to live upon this heap of arid mountains, in the midst of which a valley, with some humidity, a little plain of a kilometre, gives rise to the cry of miracle. Never was the opposition that exists between opulence and high art so plainly visible. Macedonia, on the contrary, will some day resemble Switzerland or the south of Germany. Its villages are gigantic tufts of trees ; it has everything necessary to become a country of high culture, of great industry : namely, vast plains, rich mountains, green fields, extensive aspects, very different from those charming little labyrinths of the Grecian situation. Gloomy and grave, the Macedonian peasant has none of the braggadocio and trifling spirit of the Hellenic peasant. The women, beautiful and chaste, work in the fields like the men. One would say that they are a people of Protestant peasants. They are a good, strong race, laborious, sedentary, loving their country, and full of promise for the future.

• Embarking at Troas, Paul and his companions—Silas, Timothy, and probably Luke—sailing before the wind, touched the first evening at Samothrace, and the next day landed at Neapolis,⁴ a city situated on a little promontory opposite the isle of Thasos. Neapolis was the port of the large city of Philippi, situated three leagues farther in the interior.⁵ This was the point where the Egnatian road, which crossed Macedonia and Thrace from west to east, touched the sea. Taking this road, which they were not to leave until they reached Thessalonica, the apostles mounted the staircase paved and cut in the rock which overlooks Neapolis, crossed the little chain of mountains which forms the coast, and entered upon the beautiful plain, in the centre of which the city of Philippi⁶ looms up on an advanced promontory of the mountain.

This rich plain, the lowest portion of which is covered with a lake and marshes, communicates with the basin of the St. mon, behind the Pangæus. The gold mines, which, in the Hellenic

and Macedonian period, had made the reputation of the country, were now almost abandoned. But the military importance of the position of Philippi,⁷ locked between the mountain and the marsh, had given it a new life. The battle, which, ninety-four years before the arrival of the Christian missionaries, had been fought at its gates, was for it the cause of an unexpected splendor.⁸ Augustus had established one of the most considerable of the Roman colonies there, with the *jus italicum*.⁹ The city was much more Latin than Greek. The Latin was the common language there. The religions of Latium seemed to have been transported thither in their entirety. The surrounding plain, sown with burghs, was, at the epoch of which we are now speaking, likewise a sort of Roman canton thrown into the heart of Thrace.¹⁰ The colony was assigned to the Voltinia¹¹ tribe. It had been principally formed from the *débris* of Antony's party, which Augustus had cantoned in these latitudes. There were portions of the old Thracian stock mingled with them.¹² At any rate, they were a very laborious and religious people,¹³ living in order and peace. The brotherhoods were flourishing there, particularly under the patronage of the god Silvanus,¹⁴ who was considered a sort of tutelary genius of the Latin rule.¹⁵ The mysteries of the Thracian Bacchus¹⁶ covered elevated ideas on immortality, and rendered familiar to the population the images of a future life and idyllic Paradise, very similar to those which Christianity was to spread.¹⁷ Polytheism was, in these countries, less complicated than elsewhere. The religion of Sabazius, common in Thrace and Phrygia, in close connection with ancient Orphism, and attached again through the syncretism of the period to the Dionysian mysteries, contained germs of Monotheism.¹⁸ A certain taste for infantile simplicity¹⁹ prepared the way for the Gospel. Everything points to honest, earnest, and mild customs. One feels himself in an atmosphere similar to that which gave birth to the bucolic and sentimental poetry of Virgil. The plain, ever verdant, presented the varied cultivation of vegetables and flowers.²⁰ Fine

springs, gushing out from the foot of the mountain of golden marble, spread, when well-directed, richness, shade, and freshness. Groups of poplars, willows, fig-trees, cherry-trees, and wild vines breathing out the most delicious odor, hide the streams which flow on every side. Elsewhere, fields inundated, or covered with high reeds, contained herds of buffalo, with dull white eyes and enormous horns, their heads alone above the water; while bees, and swarms of black and blue butterflies whirl about the flowers. The Pangæus, with its majestic summits covered with snow till the month of June, advances as if to cross the marsh and join the city. Beautiful chains of mountains close in the horizon on all the other sides, only leaving one opening, through which the sky escapes and shows us, in the clear distance, the basin of the Strymon. Philippi offered the mission a most suitable field. We have already seen how, in Galatia, the Roman colonies of Antioch of Pisidia and Iconium had very favorably received the new doctrine. We shall observe the same thing at Corinth, and Alexandria Troas. The populations, undisturbed for a long period with extensive local traditions, showed themselves less anxious for novelties. The Jewry of Philippi, if there was one, was inconsiderable. Everything was confined, probably, to the women celebrating the Sabbath. Even in cities where there were no Jews, the Sabbath was generally celebrated by a few persons.²¹ At any rate, it appears that there was no synagogue there.²² It was the first of the week when the apostolic troupe entered the city. Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke remained a few days within doors, waiting, as usual, for the Sabbath. Luke, who knew the country, recollected that those converted to Jewish customs were in the habit of coming together on that day, outside the suburbs, on the borders of a little river much embanked, which flows out of the ground at a league and a half from the city, causing an enormous boiling spring, and called *Gangas* or *Gangites*.²³ Probably this was the ancient Aryan name of the sacred rivers (*Ganga*).²⁴ But certain it is that the

peaceful scene related in the Acts, and which marked the first establishment of Christianity in Macedonia, took place on the very spot, where, a century before, the fate of the world had been decided.²⁵ The Gangites marked, in the great battle of the year 42 B. C., the front of the line of Brutus and Cassius.

In the cities where there was no synagogue, the reunions of those affiliated to Judaism took place in small, roofless buildings, or frequently simply in the open air, in spaces hardly enclosed, called *proseuche*.²⁶ They liked these oratories near the sea or rivers, in order to have facilities for ablutions.²⁷ The apostles went to the place indicated. Several women went there, in fact, to make their devotions. The apostles spoke to them and announced the mystery of Jesus to them. They listened attentively. One woman, especially, was moved. "The Lord," says the narrator of the Acts, "opened her heart." They called her Lydia, or "The Lydian," because she was from Thyatira.²⁸ She was trading in one of the principal products of Lydian industry,²⁹ namely, purple. She was a pious person, of that order called "devout," that is to say, a heathen by birth, but observing the precepts termed "Noachian."³⁰ She had herself and her whole household baptized, and was not satisfied until she had persuaded the four missionaries to abide with her. They remained there several weeks, teaching every Saturday at the place of prayers, on the borders of the *Gangites*.

A little church, almost wholly composed of women,³¹ very pious, very obedient, and very devoted to Paul,³² was established. Beside Lydia, this church numbered among the members, Euodias and Syntyche,³³ who fought bravely with the apostle for the Gospel, but who disputed among themselves sometimes in relation to their office as deaconesses;³⁴ Epaphroditus, a courageous man, whom Paul treated as a brother, companion in labor, and fellow-soldier;³⁵ Clement and others still, whom Paul calls "his companions in labor, and whose names," he says, "are written in the book of life."³⁶ Timothy was also greatly loved by the Philippians, and was very devoted to them.³⁷ This was the

only church from which Paul accepted pecuniary aid,³⁸ because it was rich, and not burthened with poor Jews. Lydia was, without doubt, the principal source of these gifts. Paul accepted them from her, for he knew her to be strongly attached to him. Woman gives with her heart ; with her, there are no reproaches, nor expected repayment to be feared. Paul preferred, without a doubt, to be in debt to a woman (probably a widow) on whom he could rely, than to men with whom he would have been less independent, had he been grateful.

The absolute purity of Christian morals prevented any suspicion. And probably it is not too presumptuous to suppose that it is Lydia, whom Paul in his epistle to the Philippians calls "true yoke-fellow."³⁹ This expression may be, if we so desire it, a simple metaphor.⁴⁰ Is it, nevertheless, perfectly impossible that Paul should have contracted a closer union with this sister ? We cannot say. The only certainty is that Paul took no sister with him on his journeys. An entire branch of ecclesiastical tradition has, in spite of this, pretended that he was married.⁴¹

The character of the Christian woman was becoming marked, more and more. To the Jewish woman, at times so impetuous, so devoted, to the Syrian woman, who owes her flashes of enthusiasm and love to the soft languor of a diseased organization ; to Tabitha, to Mary of Magdala, succeed the Grecian women, Lydia, Phœbe, Chloe,—lively, gay, active, mild, eminent, ready for everything and still discreet, giving up to their master, serving as subordinates, capable of the greatest sacrifices, because content to be the helpers and sisters of men, to aid them in the performance of good and beautiful actions. These Grecian women, of a fine and strong race, upon growing old undergo a change which transforms them. They become pale ; their eyes wander slightly. Covering then, with a black veil, the flat braids of hair which surround their cheeks, they give themselves up to austere cares, and display an earnest and intelligent ardor. The "servant," or Grecian deaconess, even surpassed the one of

Syria and Palestine in courage. These women, guardians of the secrets of the church, confronted the greatest dangers, and supported every torture rather than divulge anything.⁴² They created the dignity of their sex, precisely because they did not speak of their rights; they did more than the men by apparently restricting themselves to serving them.

An incident took place which hastened the departure of the missionaries. The city began to talk about them, and already the imaginations were occupied with the wonderful virtues attributed to them, especially in exorcisms. One day, as they were going to the place of prayers, they met a young slave, probably a ventriloquist,⁴³ who passed for a pythoness, foretelling the future. Her masters earned considerable money in this disgraceful pursuit. The poor girl, either because her spirit was in reality moved, or that she was tired of her low calling, no sooner perceived the missionaries than she began to follow them, with loud cries. The faithful pretended that she was rendering homage to the new faith, and to those who preached it. This took place several days. Finally, one day Paul exorcised her. The girl calmed, pretended to be delivered from the spirit which possessed her, but the vexation of her masters was very great. By the cure of the young girl, they lost their means of livelihood. They brought a suit against Paul, author of the exorcism, and against Silas as his accomplice,⁴⁴ and led them to the *Agora*, before the duumvirs.⁴⁵

It would have been a difficult matter to base a claim for indemnity upon so singular a cause. The complainants dwelt especially upon the trouble caused in the city, and unlawful preaching. "They teach customs," said they, "which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans." The city in truth was in possession of the *jus italicum*, and the freedom of worship became less in proportion as the persons stood in closer connection with the Roman city. The superstitious populace, excited by the masters of the pythoness, made at the same time a hostile demonstration against the apostles.

This kind of petty disturbances was frequent in ancient cities, — the innovators, the unemployed, “the pillars of the *Agora*,” as Demosthenes called them, lived by them.⁴⁶ The duumvirs, believing that it was only a question of ordinary Jews, without information or investigation concerning the standing of the persons,⁴⁷ condemned Paul and Silas to be beaten. The lictors tore the clothes off the apostles, and beat them cruelly before the people.⁴⁸ They then dragged them to prison,⁴⁹ put them into one of the innermost cells, and made their feet fast in stocks.

Either because it had not been permitted them to defend themselves,⁵⁰ or because they coveted the glory of suffering humiliations for their master,⁵¹ neither Paul nor Silas had taken advantage of their title of citizens, before the tribunal.⁵² It was during the night, while in prison, that they declared their standing. The jailor was much moved. Up to that moment he had treated the two Jews with severity; now he found himself in the presence of two Romans, *Paulus* and *Sylvanus*, unjustly condemned. He washed their wounds, and gave them food. It is probable that the duumvirs were notified at the same time; for at early dawn, they sent the lictors with orders to the jailor to release the prisoners. The *Valerian* law and the *Porcian* laws were precise; the application of the bastinado to a Roman citizen constituted a grave offence for the magistrate.⁵³ Paul, profiting by these advantages, refused to go out thus privily. He insisted, it is said, that the duumvirs should come themselves and set him at liberty. The confusion of the former was very great; they went and persuaded Paul to leave the city. The two prisoners, once set free, went to the house of Lydia. They were received as martyrs; they addressed the last words of exhortation and consolation to the brethren, and set out. In no city had Paul so loved and been loved. Timothy, who was not implicated in the matter, and Luke, who occupied a secondary position, remained at Philippi.⁵⁴ Luke and Paul were not to see each other again for five years.

Paul and Silas, upon leaving Philippi, followed the Egnatian road, and directed their steps towards Amphipolis. It was one of Paul's most beautiful day's journeys. Upon leaving the plain of Philippi the road enters a pleasant valley, overlooked by the massy heights of the Pangæus.⁵⁵ Flax, and plants of the most temperate climes, are cultivated here. Large villages are visible in all the folds of the mountains. The Roman highway is paved with marble flagging. At every step, under almost every plane-tree, the traveller finds deep wells, filled with water coming directly from the neighboring snows, and filtered through thick layers of permeable earth. Little rivers, wonderfully clear, flow out from rocks of white marble. 'Tis here that they learn to rank good water highest among the gifts of nature. Amphipolis was a large city and provincial capital,⁵⁶ about one hour's journey from the mouth of the Strymon. The apostles appear not to have stopped here,⁵⁷ probably because it was purely a Hellenic city.

From Amphipolis, the apostles, after leaving the estuary of the Strymon, took their way between the sea and the mountain, through thick woods and fields, which advance to the sand on the beach. The first halting-place, under plane-trees, near a very cold spring, which rises through the sand a few steps from the sea, is a delicious place. The apostles then entered into the Aulon of Arethusa, a deep ravine, a sort of perpendicular Bosphorus, which serves as outlet to the waters of the interior lakes, towards the sea.⁵⁸ They passed, probably unconsciously, by the side of the tomb of Euripides.⁵⁹ The beauty of the trees, the freshness of the air, the rapidity of the waters, the luxuriancy of the ferns and arbutus of all kinds, remind one of a site in the Grande Chartreuse or of the Grésivaudan, thrown at the door of a furnace. The basin of the Mygdonian lakes is in truth torrid, veritable surfaces of melted lead. Adders, swimming with their heads out of water, and seeking for shade, alone cause a few ripples. The flocks, towards noon, gathered close at the foot of the trees, appear worn out. Were it not for the hum of the insects,

and the singing of the birds, which, of created beings, alone resist this lassitude, one would believe himself in the dominion of death. Passing through the little city of Apollonia,⁶⁰ without making a halt, Paul skirted the southern shore of the lakes, and proceeding almost to the depth of the plain of which they occupied the central depression, he arrived at the little chain of heights which shut in the Gulf of Thessalonica on the east side. Upon reaching the summit of these hills, Olympus is visible in the horizon, in all its splendor. The base and the lower portion of the mountain mingle with the blue sky. The snows of the summit appear like an ethereal dwelling-place, suspended in space. But alas! already was the sacred mountain devastated. Men had scaled its heights, and discovered that the gods no longer inhabited it. When Cicero, from his place of exile in Thessalonica, saw these white summits, he knew that there was only snow and rock there. Paul, without a doubt, had not a thought for these enchanting places of another race. A large city was before him, and his experience told him, that he would find there an excellent basis whereon to found something great.

Since the Roman domination, Thessalonica had become one of the most commercial ports on the Mediterranean. It was a very rich and populous city.⁶¹ It contained a large synagogue, serving as a religious centre to the Judaism of Philippi, Amphipolis, and Apollonia, which only had oratories.⁶² Paul here pursued his invariable course. During three consecutive Sabbaths he spoke in the synagogue, repeating his uniform discourse upon Jesus, proving that he was the Messiah, that the Scriptures had been fulfilled in him, that he had been called to suffer death, and that he had risen from the dead. Several Jews were converted, but the conversions were specially numerous among the "devout" Greeks. It was always this class which furnished the new faith with its most zealous adherents.

Great numbers of women appeared. The best female society

of Thessalonica had for a long while observed Sabbath and the Jewish ceremonies. The *élite* of these pious ladies hastened to the new preachers.⁶³ Many of the heathens were thus converted.⁶⁴ The customary phenomena of thaumaturgy, of glossology, of gifts of the Holy Spirit, of mystic effusions, and trances, were produced.⁶⁵ The church of Thessalonica soon rivalled that of Philippi, in piety and delicate attentions to the apostle.⁶⁶ No where did Paul dispense more ardor, tenderness, and penetrating grace.⁶⁷ This man, naturally quick and impulsive, displayed in his missions a surprising mildness and calmness. He was a father, a mother, a nurse, as he himself expressed it.⁶⁸ His austerity, and even his ugliness, only added to his charm of manner. Rude and rough natures have, when they wish to be tender and fervent, a matchless, seductive charm. By severe language, destitute of flattering words,⁶⁹ one is much more likely to carry his point, especially with women, than by an effeminate style, which is often the index of weak or selfish views.

Paul and Silas sojourned with a certain Jesus, Israelite by race,⁷⁰ who, according to the usage of the Jews, had Grecized his name into that of Jason, but they accepted nothing save lodging. Paul worked night and day at his trade, in order to be no expense to the church.⁷¹ The rich dealer in purple of Philippi, and her sister colleagues, would have regretted that any other than themselves should have furnished the apostle with the necessaries of life. Twice during his sojourning in Thessalonica,⁷² Paul received an offering from Philippi which he accepted. He did this entirely against his principles, his rule being to care for himself, without receiving anything from the churches. But he would have been over-scrupulous in refusing this heartfelt gift. The sorrow he would have caused the pious women prevented him. Perhaps, moreover, as we have already said, he preferred being indebted to women, who would never impede his action, rather than to men, like Jason, for instance, with respect to whom he wished to preserve his authority. Nowhere, apparently, more than at Thessalonica,

did Paul succeed in satisfying his ideal. The population to which he addressed himself was mostly comprised of laborious artisans. Paul entered into their spirit, preached order, labor, and good conduct towards the heathen, to them. An entire new series of precepts was added to his lessons: economy, application to business, industrial honor, founded upon wealth and independence.⁷³ By a contrast which should no longer surprise us,⁷⁴ he revealed to them at the same time the most fantastic mysteries of the Apocalypse, such as they were imagined.⁷⁵

The church of Thessalonica became a model, which Paul took pleasure in mentioning,⁷⁶ and of which the good reputation spread around like an odor of edification.⁷⁷ Besides Jason, Gaius, Aristarchus, and Secundus⁷⁸ were appointed among the chiefs of the church. Aristarchus was circumcised.⁷⁹

What had already taken place twenty times occurred again at Thessalonica.⁸⁰ Discontented Jews stirred up troubles. They recruited bands of idlers, of vagrants, and of those loiterers of all kinds, who, in the ancient cities, passed day and night under the columns of the Basilicas, ready to make a noise for those who paid them. They all went together to attack Jason's house. They demanded Paul and Silas with loud cries. As they were not to be found, the rioters seized Jason and several of the faithful with him, and led them to the poliarchs,⁸¹ or magistrates. Most confused cries were heard. "The revolutionists are in the city," said some, and "Jason has received them." "All these people," said the others, "are in revolt against the decrees of the emperor." "They have a king whom they call Jesus," said a third. The trouble was great, and the poliarchs were not without fear. They forced Jason, and the faithful who had been arrested with him, to give security, and sent them away. The night following, the brethren led Paul and Silas out of the city, and sent them to Berea.⁸² The ill-feeling of the Jews continued against the little church, which only served to consolidate it.⁸³

The Jews of Berea were more liberal, and better bred than

those of Thessalonica.⁸⁴ They listened willingly, and allowed Paul to set forth his ideas in the synagogue. During several days there was among them a lively increase of curiosity. They passed the time searching the Scriptures, in order to find the texts quoted by Paul, and see if they were exact. Many were converted: among others, a certain Jew named Sopater, the son of Pyrrhus.⁸⁵ Here, however, as in all other churches of Macedonia, the women were in the majority. The converts all belonged to the Greek race, to that class of devout persons, who, though not Jewesses, practised the ceremonies of Judaism. Many Greeks and proselytes were also converted, and the synagogue, for a wonder, remained quiet. The storm came from Thessalonica. The Jews of that city, having learned that Paul had preached with success at Berea, went to the latter city and renewed their proceedings. Paul was again obliged to set out in haste without taking Silas. Several of the brethren of Berea accompanied him to conduct him.

The alarm had been so generally given in the synagogues of Macedonia, that it appeared to become impossible for Paul to remain in that country. He saw himself tracked from city to city, while disturbances, as it were, sprang up under his feet. The Roman police was not very inimical to him; but they acted, under these circumstances, according to the principles of the police. So soon as there was trouble in the streets they accused every one wrongly, and without inquiring into the just rights of him who served as a pretext for the agitation, requested him to be quiet or pass on. It amounted to the same thing as justifying the disturbance, and establishing the principle that a few fanatics were sufficient to deprive the citizen of his liberties. The policeman has never prided himself on being very philosophical. Paul resolved, therefore, to set out and direct his steps towards a country so distant that the hatred of his adversaries might lose the trail. Leaving Silas and Timothy in Macedonia he directed his course, accompanied by the Bereans, toward the sea.⁸⁶ Thus was finished this brilliant mission of Macedonia,

the most fruitful of all that Paul had as yet accomplished. Churches composed of entirely new elements were established. It was no longer Syrian levity or Lycaonian good-nature. They were fine, delicate, elegant, intelligent races, who, prepared by Judaism, now betook themselves to the new faith. The coast of Macedonia was entirely covered with Greek colonies. The Greek genius had there borne its best fruits. These noble churches of Thessalonica and Philippi, composed of the most distinguished women of each city,⁸⁷ were, without comparison, the two most beautiful conquests that Christianity had yet made. The Jewess is surpassed. Submissive, retired, obedient, taking little part in religion, the Jewess was seldom converted. It was the "devout"⁸⁸ woman, the Greek, tired of those goddesses brandishing lances on the tops of Acropoles; the virtuous wife, turning her back to effete paganism and seeking a pure religion, who was drawn towards heaven. They are the second founders of our faith. After the Galilean women, who followed Jesus and ministered unto him, Lydia, Phebe, and the pious unknown ladies of Philippi and Thessalonica, are the true saints to whom the new faith owed its most rapid progress.

CHAPTER VII.

CONTINUATION OF THE SECOND JOURNEY OF PAUL. — PAUL AT
ATHENS.

PAUL, still accompanied by the faithful Bereans, set sail toward Athens.¹ From the head of the Gulf of Therma to Phaleria or to the Piræus is a sail of three or four days in a small vessel. You pass the foot of Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion, follow the sinuosities of the interior sea, which Eubœa separates from the rest of the *Ægean* sea,² and cross the singular strait of Euripus. Upon every tack, you graze this truly holy land, where perfection once unveiled itself, where the ideal has really existed. This land has seen the noblest of races founding, at the same time, art, science, philosophy, and politics. Doubtless Paul did not feel, upon landing there, that species of filial sentiment which cultivated men experience upon setting foot upon this venerable soil.³ He belonged to another world. His holy land was elsewhere.

Greece had not arisen again after the terrible blows which had fallen upon her in the late centuries. Like the sons of Earth, these aristocratic tribes had torn each other, — the Romans had finished the extermination, the old families had almost disappeared. The ancient cities of Thebes and Argos had become wretched villages; Olympia and Sparta were humiliated; Athens and Corinth alone had survived. The country was almost a desert. The image of desolation which we derive from the paintings of Polybius, Cicero, Strabo, and Pausanias is heart-rending.⁴ The appearances of liberty which the Romans had left in the cities, and which were not to disappear until under the reign of Vespasian,⁵ were merely ironical. The bad administration of the Romans had ruined everything;⁶ temples were no longer cared for; at every step there were pedestals from which the conquerors

new rulers.⁷ The Peloponnesus was struck with death. Sparta had killed it. Burned by the proximity of this mad Utopia, that poor country had never recovered itself.⁸ In the Roman period, moreover, the system of large and centralizing cities had succeeded to that of numerous petty centres. Corinth absorbed all life.

The race, if we except Corinth, had remained, nevertheless, quite pure. The number of Jews outside of Corinth, was inconsiderable.⁹ Greece received but one single Roman colony. The invasions of the Slavonians and Albani, who so materially changed the Hellenic blood, did not take place until later. The old religions were still flourishing.¹⁰ A few women, unbeknown to their husbands, were practising very secretly in the depths of the Gynæceum, foreign superstitions, especially Egyptian,¹¹ but the sages protested. "What God," said they, "is that who is pleased with the secret homage of a married woman! The wife should have no other friends than those of her husband. Are not the gods our first friends?"¹²

It appears that either during the voyage, or at the moment of his arrival at Athens, Paul regretted having left his companions in Macedonia. Probably this new world astonished him. He found himself too isolated. Certain it is that on dismissing the faithful Bereans he charged them to tell Silas and Timothy to come to him as soon as possible.¹³ Paul was therefore alone at Athens for a few days. This had not happened to him for a very long while. His life had been like a whirlwind, and he had never travelled without two or three companions. There was but one Athens in the world, and surely it was something totally different from what Paul had as yet seen. Therefore his perplexity was very great. While waiting for his companions, he confined himself to walking through the city in every direction.¹⁴ The Acropolis, with that infinite number of statues which covered it, and transformed it into a museum such as never had existed,¹⁵ must have been the special object of his most original reflections.

Athens, although having suffered a great deal from Sylla; although pillaged, like all Greece, by the Roman administrators,¹⁶ and already partially stripped by the gross covetousness of its masters, was still ornamented with almost all its masterpieces. The monuments of the Acropolis were intact. A few unskillful additions of detail, quite a number of mediocre works which had already glided into the sanctuary of high art, of impertinent substitution which had placed Romans on the pedestals of old Greeks,¹⁷ had not changed the sanctity of this immaculate temple of the Beautiful. The *Pæcile*, with its brilliant decoration, was as fresh as the first day. The exploits of the odious Secundus Carinas, the provider of statues for the "Golden House," did not commence till several years after, and Athens suffered less than Delphi and Olympia.¹⁸ The bad taste of the Romans for cities with colonnades had not penetrated here. The houses were poor, and hardly comfortable. This exquisite city was, at the same time, an irregular one, with narrow streets, — the preserver of her old monuments preferring Archaic remembrancers to streets drawn in straight lines.¹⁹ So many wonders scarcely moved the apostle. He saw the only perfect things which have ever existed, which ever will exist: the Propylæa, that noble masterpiece; the Parthenon, which destroys all other grandeur except its own; the temple of wingless Victory, worthy of the battles which it consecrated; the Erechtheum, prodigy of elegance and *finesse*; the Errhephores, those divine young girls of so graceful a carriage. He saw all that, and his faith was not shaken. He did not startle. The prejudices of the iconoclastic Jew, insensible to plastic beauties, blinded him. He regarded these incomparable images as idols. "His spirit," says his biographer, "was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry."²⁰ Ah! beautiful and chaste images, true gods and true goddesses, tremble! — here is one who will raise the hammer against you. The fatal word has been pronounced, — ye are idols. The error of this ugly little Jew will prove your death-warrant.

Among so many things which he did not understand, there

were two which impressed the apostle deeply : first, the very religious character of the Athenians,²¹ manifested by a multitude of temples, altars, and sanctuaries of all sorts,²² signs of the tolerant eclecticism which they carried into religion ; second, certain altars, anonymous or raised to “unknown gods.”²³ These altars were rather numerous in Athens and its suburbs.²⁴ Other cities of Greece also had them.²⁵ Those of the port of Phaleria (Paul had been able to see them when landing) were celebrated. They connected them with the legends of the Trojan war.²⁶ They bore the inscription :—

ΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΙΣΘΕΟΙΣ.

(To the unknown gods.)

Some even may have borne :—

ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩΙΘΕΩΙ.

(To an unknown god.)²⁷

These altars owed their existence to the great scruples of the Athenians in regard to religious things, and to their habit of seeing the manifestations of a mysterious and special power in every object. Fearing to offend some god of whose name they were ignorant, or of neglecting a powerful god, or rather wishing to obtain a favor which might depend upon a certain divinity unknown to them, they erected anonymous altars, or altars with the above-mentioned inscriptions. Probably too, these fantastic inscriptions originated from altars at first anonymous,²⁸ and to which, in the operation of a general census, they may have given such inscriptions from the fact of not knowing to whom they belonged. Paul was much surprised at these dedications. Interpreting them in his Jewish mind, he imputed to them a sense which they did not possess. He believed that it had reference to some god called *par excellence* the “unknown God.”²⁹ He saw in this “unknown God,” the god of the Jews, the only god toward whom Paganism itself might have some mysterious aspiration.³⁰

This idea was the more natural in the eyes of the pagans, as that which characterizes the god of the Jews, is the fact that he is a nameless god, an uncertain god.³¹ Or, perhaps it was in some religious ceremony, or in some philosophical discussion, that Paul heard the hemistich, "Ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν," taken from the hymn of Cleanthes to Jupiter, or from the *Phenomena* of Aratus,³² and which frequently occurred in the religious hymns.³³ He grouped these features of local coloring within his mind, and strove to compose a discourse appropriate to his new audience, for he felt that it would be necessary now to modify his preaching materially.

Assuredly, Athens was far from being then, what she had been for centuries, the centre of human progress, the capital of the Republic of Minds. Faithful to her ancient genius, this divine mother of every art was one of the last asylums of liberalism and republican spirit. It was what might be called a city of opposition. Athens was always in favor of the lost causes. She declared earnestly for the independence of Greece, and for Mithridates against the Romans; for Pompey against Cæsar; for the republicans against the triumvirs; for Antony against Octavius.³⁴ She reared statues to Brutus and Cassius alongside those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton.³⁵ She honored Germanicus, to the point of compromising herself. She merited the injuries done her by Piso.³⁶ Sylla sacked her in an atrocious manner,³⁷ and gave her democratic constitution its quietus. Augustus, though mild toward her, was not favorable to her. Her title of free city was never taken from her;³⁸ but the privileges of the free cities were ever on the wane, under the Cæsars and the Flavians. Thus, the position of Athens was that of a suspected city, disgraced, but ennobled for this very reason. At the accession of Nerva, a new life began for her.³⁹ The world returned to reason, and virtue recognized its mother. Nerva, Herod, Atticus, Hedrian, Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, restore her, and vie in endowing her with monuments and new institutions. For four centuries does Athens again become the city of philosophers,

artists, *beaux esprits*,—the holy city of every liberal soul, the pilgrimage of those who love the beautiful and the true.

But let us not go too far. At the sad period now under consideration, the ancient splendor had disappeared, the new had not begun. It was no longer the “city of Theseus,” and it was not yet the “city of Hadrian.”

In the first century before our era, the Athenian school of philosophy had been very brilliant. Philo of Larissa, Antiochus of Ascalon, had continued the academy⁴⁰ or modified it.⁴¹ Cratippus was teaching peripateticism there, and knew how to be at the same moment the friend, master, consoler, or *protégé* of Pompey, Cæsar, Cicero, and Brutus. The most celebrated Romans, and those most given up to occupations, drawn to the Orient by their ambition, all stopped at Athens to listen to the philosophers in vogue. Atticus, Crassus, Cicero, Varro, Ovid, Horace, Agrippa, and Virgil, had either studied or resided there as *amateurs*. Brutus passed his last winter there, sharing his time between the peripatetic Cratippus, and the academician Theomnestes.⁴² Athens was, on the eve of the battle of Philippi, a centre of opinion of the highest importance. The instruction given there was entirely philosophic,⁴³ and very superior to the insipid eloquence of the school of Rhodes. What really injured Athens was the accession of Augustus and the universal pacification. Suspicion then attached itself to the teaching of philosophy.⁴⁴ The schools lost their importance and their activity.⁴⁵ Rome, moreover, by the brilliant literary evolution which she performed, became for some time half and half independent of Greece, in respect to affairs of genius. Other centres had been formed as a school of varied instruction. Marseilles was preferred.⁴⁶ The original philosophy of the four great sects had ended. Eclecticism, a sort of weak way of philosophizing without a system, began. If we except Ammonius of Alexandria, a master of Plutarch,⁴⁷ who about this time founded at Athens a sort of literary philosophy which was to become popular from the date of the reign of Hadrian, no one towards the middle

of the first century renders illustrious the city of the world which has produced or attracted the largest number of celebrated men. The statues which they now dedicate with a deplorable prodigality on the Acropolis are those of consuls, proconsuls, Roman magistrates, and members of the imperial family.⁴⁸ The temples which they erect there are consecrated to the gods of Rome and to Augustus;⁴⁹ there were even statues of Nero.⁵⁰ The artists of talent having been enticed to Rome, the Athenian works of the first century are for the most part of a surprising mediocrity.⁵¹ And further, those monuments, as, for instance, the tower of Andronicus Cyrestes, the portico of Athena Archegetes, the temple of Rome and Augustus, the mausoleum of Philopapus, are somewhat anterior or subsequent to the time at which Paul visited Athens. Never before in its long history had the city been more speechless or more quiet.

She still preserved, however, a large part of her nobleness. She still held the most advanced position in the attention of the world. In spite of the severity of the times, the respect for Athens was very great, and every one felt it.⁵² Sylla, although so terrible for his rebellion, had pity on her.⁵³ It was the goal of Cicero's vanity to have a statue there.⁵⁴ Pompey and Cæsar, before the battle of Pharsalia, caused a herald to proclaim that the Athenians would all be spared as priests of the Thesmo-phorian goddesses.⁵⁵ Pompey gave a large sum of money to ornament the city.⁵⁶ Cæsar refused to take vengeance on her,⁵⁷ and contributed towards the erection of one of its monuments.⁵⁸ Brutus and Cassius acted like private persons there, received and fêted as heroes. Antony liked Athens, and willingly resided there.⁵⁹ After the battle of Actium, Augustus pardoned her for the third time. His name, like that of Cæsar, remained attached to a considerable monument.⁶⁰ His family and its connections were regarded at Athens as benefactors.⁶¹ The Romans prided themselves upon asserting that they left Athens free and honored.⁶² Spoiled children of glory, the Greeks henceforth lived upon the remembrances of their past. While residing in Athens,

Germanicus did not wish to be preceded by more than one lictor.⁶³ Nero, who, however, was not superstitious,⁶⁴ did not dare to enter there, through fear of the Furies who lived under the Areopagus, of those terrible "Semnes" so dreaded by patricides. The recollection of Orestes made him tremble; nor did he dare to face the Eleusinian mysteries, at the commencement of which the herald cried out that wretches and profane ones⁶⁵ should keep their distance. Noble foreigners, descendants of dethroned kings,⁶⁶ went to Athens to spend their money, and delighted to see themselves decorated with the titles of Chœregus and Agonothete. All the petty barbarian kings vied with each other in rendering services to the Athenians in restoring their monuments.⁶⁷

Religion was one of the causes of these exceptional favors. Essentially municipal and political in its origin, based upon the myths relating to the foundation of the city and her divine protectors, the religion of Athens was at first merely the religious consecration of the patriotism and institutions of the city. It was the religion of the Acropolis. "Agraulos," and the oath which the young Athenians took upon his altar, have no other signification, — about the same thing as if religion among us consisted in being enrolled for military duty, drilling, and honoring the flag. That was soon to become very insipid; that contained nothing of the infinite; nothing which might interest man with respect to his destiny; nothing universal. The railleries of Aristophanes against these gods of the Acropolis⁶⁸ prove that they, of themselves, would have in no wise captivated all races. At an early day, the women turned towards petty foreign devotions, as, for instance, those of Adonis. Mysteries above all became popular. Philosophy, in the hands of Plato, was a delicious mythology of its kind; while art was creating for the multitude images really adorable. The gods of Athens became the gods of beauty. The old Athena Poliades was only a manikin, apparently without arms, wrapped up in a peplos, like the Madonna of Loretto. The toreutic art performed an unpa-

ralleled miracle. It made realistic statues, after the style of Italian and Byzantine madonnas, loaded with inlaid ornaments, which were at the same time marvellous masterpieces. In this manner Athens came into possession of one of the most complete religions of antiquity. This religion suffered a sort of eclipse at the time of the misfortunes of the city. The Athenians were the first to pollute their sanctuary. Lachares stole the gold from the statue of Athena; Demetrius Poliorcetes was installed by the inhabitants themselves into the inner *cella* of the Parthenon; he lodged his courtesans near him, and there was jesting in regard to the scandal that such a neighborhood must cause the chaste goddess;⁶⁹ Aristion, the last defender of Athenian independence, allowed the eternal lamp of Athena Poliades to go out.⁷⁰ Such was, nevertheless, the glory of this ancient city that the universe was apparently influenced to adopt her goddess at the moment at which she abandoned her.

The Parthenon, through the action of foreigners, recovered her honors. The mysteries of Athens constituted a religious attraction for the entire heathen world.⁷¹

But it was principally as a city of instruction that Athens exercised a wonderful prestige. This new destiny, which through the instrumentality of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius was to assume so marked a character, had commenced two centuries before.⁷² The city of Miltiades and Pericles had been transformed into an university city, a sort of Oxford, — the rendezvous of all the young nobility, who spent their money there liberally.⁷³ There was no one but professors, philosophers, rhetoricians, pedagogues of all kinds, magistrates, masters of gymnasiums, gymnasiarchs, teachers of wrestling, drill-sergeants, masters of fencing and riding.⁷⁴ Dating from Hadrina, the *cosmetes* or magistrates of the *gymnasia* assume in a certain measure the importance and dignity of archons. The years are dated from them. The old Greek education, destined in principle to form the free citizen, becomes the pedagogical law of the human race.⁷⁵ Alas! it no longer forms much else than rhetoricians. The

exercises of the body, formerly the true occupation of the heroes on the borders of the Ilissus, are now an *affaire de pose*. A circus grandeur, a Franconi style, has replaced the real grandeur.⁷⁶ But it is the peculiarity of Greece to have ennobled everything. Even the business of the man of instruction became with her an office of morality: the dignity of professor, in spite of more than one abuse, was one of her creations.⁷⁷ That *jeunesse dorée* at times knew how to recall the beautiful discourses of its masters.⁷⁸ It was republican, like every other. It flew to arms at the call of Brutus; it immolated itself at Philippi.⁷⁹ The day was passed in discoursing upon tyrant-killing and liberty, in celebrating the noble death of Cato, and in eulogizing Brutus.

The population was always lively, witty, and inquisitive. Every one passed his life in the open air, in perpetual contact with the rest of the world, surrounded by a light atmosphere, under a heaven wreathed in smiles. The foreigners, numerous and anxious to learn, maintained a great activity of mind. Publicity, the journalism of the ancient world, if I may be permitted to make use of such an expression, had its centre at Athens. The city not having become commercial, everybody had only one care,—that was to learn the news, and keep himself informed as to what was being said and done in the world.⁸⁰ It is very remarkable that the great development of religion did not injure rational culture. Athens was able to be, at the same time, the most religious city in the world, the Pantheon of Greece, and the city of philosophers. When we see in the Theatre Dionysius the marble *fauteuils* which surround the orchestra bearing the names of the priesthood, for the incumbent of which they are destined, one would say that this was a city of priests. Nevertheless, it was most especially a city of freethinkers. The religion in question had neither dogmas nor religious books. They had not, in respect to natural philosophy, the horror which Christianity has always had, and which has led it to oppose scientific research. The priest and the atomical Epicurean, with the exception of a few disagree-

ments,⁸¹ lived quite well together. The true Greeks satisfied themselves perfectly with those agreements, founded not upon logic, but upon mutual tolerance and mutual regard.

This was for Paul a theatre of an entirely different kind. The cities where he had preached up to that time, were, for the most part, industrial cities, — sort of Leghorns or Triestes, containing large Jewries, rather than brilliant centres, — cities of good society and high culture. Athens was profoundly heathen. Paganism was there identified with all the pleasures, interests, and glories of the city. Paul hesitated a great deal. At last, Timothy arrived from Macedonia. Silas, for reasons unknown to us, had not accompanied him.⁸² Paul then resolved to act.

There was a synagogue at Athens,⁸³ and Paul spoke there to the Jews and “devout”⁸⁴ people ; but in such a city, synagogue successes amounted to very little. That brilliant *Agora* where so much mind was displayed, that *Pæcile* portico where all the questions of the world were agitated, tempted him. He spoke there, not as a preacher addressing the assembled crowd, but as a stranger, who steals in, spreads his ideas timidly, and seeks to create for himself some basis of action. The success was moderate. “Jesus and the resurrection” (*anastasis*) appeared to be strange words, devoid of sense.⁸⁵ Several, it appears, took *anastasis* for the name of a goddess, and thought that *Jesus* and *Anastasis* was some new divine couple, whom these oriental dreamers had come to preach.⁸⁶ Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, it is said, approached and listened.

This first contact of Christianity and Greek philosophy was not very friendly. It was never better seen how men of intelligence should be careful not to depend upon themselves, nor scoff at an idea, however ridiculous it may appear to them. The bad Greek spoken by Paul, his incorrect and hesitating enunciation, were not calculated to gain him credit at Athens. The philosophers turned their backs disdainfully upon these barbarous expressions. “He is a babbler” (*spermologos*),⁸⁷

said some. "He is a setter forth of strange gods," said others. Not one of them imagined that this babbler would one day supplant them, and that, four hundred and seventy-four years after,⁸⁸ their professorships would be suppressed, considered useless and hurtful, in consequence of Paul's preaching. A great lesson! Proud of their superiority, the philosophers of Athens disdained the questions of popular religion. At their side, superstition flourished. In this respect, Athens almost equalled the most religious cities of Asia Minor. The aristocracy of thinkers cared very little for the social wants which made their way through the covering of so many gross religions. Such a divorce is always punished. When philosophy declares that she will not occupy herself with religion, religion replies to her by strangling her. And this is just; for philosophy is nothing, unless it points out a path for humanity, — unless it takes a serious view of the infinite problem which is the same for all.

The liberal spirit which reigned at Athens assured Paul complete security. Neither Jews nor heathens attempted anything against him. But this tolerance was even worse than displeasure. Elsewhere the new doctrine produced a lively reaction, at least in Jewish society; here it only found inquisitive and *blasé* auditors. It appeared that one day Paul's auditors, wishing to obtain from him in some degree an official exposition of his doctrine, led him to the Areopagus, and there called upon him to tell what religion he preached. Of a truth it is possible that this may be a legend, and that the fame of the Areopagus may have led the author of the Acts, who had not been an eye-witness, to choose this illustrious *auditorium* in which to make his hero pronounce a prepared discourse, a philosophic harangue. Nevertheless,⁸⁹ this hypothesis is not necessary. The Areopagus had, under the Romans, preserved its ancient organization.⁹⁰ It had even seen its privileges increase in consequence of the policy which led the conquerors to suppress the ancient democratic institutions of Greece, and replace them by councils of notables. The Areopagus had always been the

aristocratic body of Athens. It gained what the democracy lost. Let us add, that this was an epoch of literary dilettanteism, and that this tribunal, through its classic celebrity, exercised a great *prestige*. Its moral philosophy was recognized by the entire world.⁹¹ The Areopagus thus became, under Roman rule, what it had been at different times in the history of the Athenian republic, a political body almost devoid of judiciary functions, — the true Senate of Athens, only interfering in certain cases, and constituting the conservative nobility of retired functionaries.⁹² From the commencement of the first century of our era, the Areopagus is met with in inscriptions as the head of Athenian powers, superior to the council of six hundred and to the people. The erection of statues, in particular, is done by it, or at least with its authorization.⁹³ Even in the years now under consideration, it had decreed a statue to the Queen Berenice, daughter of Agrippa the First, with the latter of whom we shall soon see Paul in connection.⁹⁴ It appears that the Areopagus also exercised a certain administration with respect to education.⁹⁵ It was a high council, — a religious, moral censorship, which had jurisdiction in everything concerning the laws, morals, medicine, luxury, edileship, and the religions of the city.⁹⁶ Nor is it improbable that, upon the appearance of a new doctrine, the preacher should have been invited to go and to some degree make his declaration to such a tribunal, or at least in the place where it held its sittings.⁹⁷ Paul, it is said, standing up in the midst of the assembly, spoke⁹⁸ as follows: —

“Athenians, — I perceive that in all things ye are too religious.⁹⁹ For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, *To the unknown God*. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.

“God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and

all things ; And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation ; That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us : For in him we live and have our being ; as certain also of your own poets have said, ‘ For we are also his offspring.’¹⁰⁰ Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at ; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent : Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained ; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.”

At these words, according to the narrator, Paul was interrupted. Hearing the resurrection of the dead spoken of, some began to jest. The more courteous said, “We will hear thee again of this matter.”

If the discourse we have just quoted was really pronounced, it must have in reality caused a very singular impression upon the cultivated minds which listened to it. This language, at times barbarous, incorrect, and without construction, at other times full of justness ; this unstudied eloquence, filled with happy hits and disagreeable faults ; this profound philosophy, bordering upon strange beliefs, must have seemed to come from another world. Immensely superior to the popular religion of Greece, such a doctrine fell, in many respects, below the current philosophy of the century. If, on the one side, it held out a hand to this philosophy by its high conception of the Divinity, and its moral unity of the human species, on the other hand¹⁰¹ it contained a portion of supernatural beliefs which no positive mind could admit. At any rate, it is not surprising it did not succeed in Athens. The motives which were to make Christianity successful existed elsewhere than in circles of lettered men. They

were in the hearts of pious women, in the secret aspirations of the poor, the slaves, and the meek of all classes. Before philosophy draws near to the new doctrine, it will be necessary that both philosophy should become much weakened and that the new doctrine should have renounced the great chimera of an impending judgment; that is to say, to the concrete ideas which were the envelope of its first formation.

Whether from Paul or from one of his disciples, this discourse, at any rate, shows us an attempt, almost the sole one of the first century, to conciliate Christianity with philosophy, and even in one sense with paganism. Affording proof of a broadness of views very remarkable in a Jew, the author acknowledges in all races a sort of interior sense of the divine, a secret instinct of monotheism, which should have borne them towards the knowledge of the true God. If we believe him, Christianity is nothing else than natural religion, to which one might arrive by simply consulting his heart and examining himself in good faith,—a two-faced idea, tending at times to bring Christianity and Deism together; at others, inspiring it with an improper pride. This is the first instance of the tactics of certain apologists of Christianity making advances to philosophy, using or pretending to use scientific language, speaking with courtesy or politeness of reason, which they decry on the other hand, wishing to give to understand, by skillfully grouped quotations, that in the main they can agree with men of letters, but leading to inevitable misunderstandings so soon as they explain themselves clearly, and speak of their supernatural dogmas. We perceive already the effort to translate Jewish and Christian ideas into the language of Grecian philosophy. We catch a glimpse of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Biblical ideas and those of Greek philosophy aspire to embrace each other; but for that they will need make many concessions to each other, for this God in whom we live and move is very different from the Jehovah of the prophets and Heavenly Father of Jesus.

The times are not yet ripe enough for such an alliance; be-

sides, it is not at Athens that it will take place. Athens, at the point to which centuries had brought her — this city of grammarians, gymnasts, and fencing-masters — was as ill-disposed as possible to receive Christianity. The mercenariness, the hardness of heart, of the man of education, are unpardonable sins in the eyes of grace. The pedagogue is the least convertible of men; for he has a religion of his own, namely, his routine, faith in his old authors, and taste for his literary exercises. This contents him, and extinguishes in him every other need. There have been found at Athens a series of Mercury-busts of cosmetes¹⁰² of the second century. They are handsome men, grave, majestic, of a noble, and still Hellenic mien. Inscriptions inform us of the honors and pensions which were conferred upon them.¹⁰³ The truly great men of the ancient democracy never had as much. Assuredly, if St. Paul met any one of the predecessors of these haughty pedants, he would not have had any more success with him than a romantic follower of neo-catholicism would have had in the time of the empire in trying to convert to his ideas a student attached to the religion of Horace, or than a humanitarian socialist would have in declaiming against English prejudices before the fellows of Oxford and Cambridge.

In a society so different from that in which he had lived until now; in the midst of rhetoricians and professors of fencing, Paul found himself, as it were, entirely within another world. His thoughts reverted unceasingly to his loved churches of Macedonia and Galatia, where he had met with so exquisite a religious sentiment. Several times he thought of setting out for Thessalonica.¹⁰⁴ A strong desire was influencing him, and the more so as he had received news that the faith of the young church was submitted to many trials. He was fearful lest his neophytes should yield to the temptations.¹⁰⁵ Obstacles, which he attributes to Satan, prevented him from following out this plan. Resigning it, as he says himself, he again deprived himself of Timothy, — sent him to Thessalonica to strengthen, exhort, and console the faithful, and remained once more alone at Athens.¹⁰⁶

Again he set to work there ; but the soil was too ungrateful. The lively spirit of the Athenians was the contrary of that religious disposition, tender and deep, which made conversions and predestined to Christianity. The really Hellenic lands took but slight interest in the doctrine of Jesus. Plutarch, living in an atmosphere purely Greek, has not as yet the slightest breath of it in the first half of the second century. Patriotism, attachment to the recollections of the country, turned the Greeks away from exotic religions. "Hellenism" became an organized religion, almost reasonable, admitting a large part of philosophy. The "gods of Greece" seemed to wish to be humanity's universal gods.

What formerly characterized the religion of the Greek, what characterizes it in our day, is the lack of the infinite, of the vague, of emotion, of feminine gentleness. The depth of the German and Celtic religious sentiment is wanting in the pure Hellenic race. The piety of the orthodox Greek consists in practices and exterior signs. The orthodox churches, at times very elegant, possess none of the terrors of a Gothic church.¹⁹⁷ In this oriental Christianity there are no tears, no prayers, no inward contrition. There, burials are almost gay, taking place in the evening, towards sunset, when the shadows are long, with low chanting and a display of gaudy colors. The fanatical gravity of the Latins displeases these mild, lively, frivolous races. The infirm is not discouraged there ; he calmly awaits death ; everything smiles around him. This is the secret of that divine gayety in the Homeric poems and in Plato. The recital of Socrates' death in the *Phædo* scarcely displays a tinge of sorrow. Life is the giving of the blossom, and then the fruit,—what more ? If, as it may be sustained, anticipation of death is the most important feature of Christianity, and of the modern religious sentiment, then the Greek race is the least religious of races. It is a superficial race, looking upon life as a thing without aught of supernatural or after-plan. Such a simplicity of conception results in a great measure from the climate, from the purity of

the air, from the wonderful joy that one breathes in, but still more from the instincts of the Hellenic race, adorably idealistic. A nothing, a tree, a flower, a lizard, a tortoise, giving rise to the recollection of a thousand metamorphoses sung by the poets ; a thread of water ; a little hollow in the rock, which they term a nymph's cave ; a well with a cup on the curb-stone ; a strait of the sea, so narrow that the butterflies cross it and still navigable for the largest vessels, as at Poros ; orange-trees, cypresses, of which the shade extends upon the sea ; a little forest of pines in the midst of rocks ;—are sufficient in Greece to produce the contentment awakened by beauty. Walking in the gardens at night, listening to the locusts, sitting in the moonlight while playing the flute, going to the mountain for water and taking with them a little roll of bread, a fish, and a cyathus of wine, which is drunk while singing ; in family festivities, hanging a crown of leaves over their door, or going with flowers in their hats ; on public *fête* days, carrying the thyrsus ornamented with leaves ; passing whole days in dancing, playing with tame goats,—such are Greek pleasures, the pleasures of a race, poor, economical, eternally young, inhabiting a beautiful country, finding their fortune in themselves and in the gifts which the gods have made them.¹⁰³ The pastoral, after the manner of Theocritus, was a reality in Hellenic countries. Greece always took pleasure in this little species of fine and pleasing poetry, one of the most characteristic of her literature, the mirror of her own life ; almost everywhere else, foolish and fictitious. Good-humor, joy at living, are things preëminently Greek. This race is always twenty years old. For them, *indulgere genio* is not the dull intoxication of the Englishman, the gross diversion of the Frenchman. It is simply thinking that nature is good, and that one can and should yield to it. In fact, nature, for the Greek, is a counsellor in matters of elegance, a mistress teaching rectitude and virtue. “Concupiscence,” that idea that nature leads us to do wrong, is nonsense to him. The taste for dress which distinguishes the palicare, and which displays itself with so much

innocence in the Greek maiden, is not the pompous vanity of the barbarian, the foolish airs of the *bourgeoise*, puffed up with the ridiculous pride of an upstart. It is the pure and delicate sentiment of ingenuous maidens, conscious of being the youths and offspring the true inventors of the beautiful.

Such a race, we can imagine, would have received Jesus with a smile. There was one thing which these exquisite children could not learn from us : profound gravity, simple honesty, devotion without ostentation, kindness without bombast. Socrates is a moralist of the first order, but he has no position in religious history. The Greek always appears to us a little blunt and heartless. He has wit, action, and acuteness ; he has nothing dreamy or melancholy about him. We Celts and Germans, with us our hearts are the sources of our genius. The depths of our nature are like a fairy fountain, clear, green, and deep, in which the Infinite is reflected. With the Greek, self-love and vanity are mingled with everything ; vague sentiment is unknown to him ; reflection upon his own destiny appears insipid to him. Made the subject of caricature, his crude way of understanding life gives to the Roman period the *græculus esuriens*, grammarian, artist, charlatan, acrobat, physician, amuser of the whole world, very similar to the Italian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ; to the Byzantine epoch, the sophistical theologian, causing religion to degenerate into subtle disputes ; to our day, the modern Greek, at times extremely vain and ungrateful, — the orthodox *papas*, with his egotistical and material religion. Woe to him who pauses at this decadence ! Shame upon him, who, in the presence of the Parthenon, thinks of observing anything ridiculous ! We must acknowledge it, however. Greece never was seriously Christian ; she is not so yet. No race ever was less romantic, less endowed with the chivalric sentiment of our modern age. Plato bases his entire theory of beauty upon doing without woman. Think of a woman in order to encourage one's self to perform brilliant actions ! A Greek would have been astounded at such language.

he thought of men assembled in the *Agora*; he thought of his country. In this respect, the Latins were nearer us. Greek poetry, incomparable in the great species such as the epics, tragedy, and disinterested lyric poetry, had not, it appears, the sweet elegiac tone of Tibullus, Virgil, Lucretius,—a tone so beautifully in harmony with our sentiments, so near to what we love.

The same difference is found between the piety of St. Bernard, St. Francis of Assisi, and that of the saints of the Greek church. These beautiful schools of Cappadocia, Syria, Egypt, of the fathers of the desert, are almost philosophical schools. The popular hagiographa of the Greeks is more mythological than that of the Latins. The most of the saints who figure in the iconostasis of a Greek house, and before whom a lamp is kept burning, are not great founders, great men, like the saints of the Occident. They are fantastic beings, ancient gods transfigured, or at least combinations of historical and mythological personages, like St. George. And this wonderful church of St. Sophia, why, it is an Arian temple; the entire human species might offer its prayers there. Never having had a pope, inquisition, scholastic theology, or barbarous middle age,—having always preserved a leaven of Arianism, Greece will give up supernatural Christianity more easily than any country, in the same way as those Athenians were formerly, thanks to a sort of levity, a thousand times more profound than the seriousness of our dull races, and still the most superstitious people, and the nearest to rationalism. The popular Greek songs are in our day full of pagan images and pagan ideas.¹⁰⁹ Most different from the Occident, the Orient preserved, during the middle ages and up to modern times, true “Hellenists,” in the main more pagan than Christian, living in the religion of the old Greek fatherland and of the old authors.¹¹⁰ These Hellenists were, in the fifteenth century, the agents of the new birth of the Occident, to which they carried the Greek texts, basis of all civilization. The same spirit has presided¹¹¹ and will preside over the destinies of new Greece.

When we have well studied what constitutes in our day the character of a cultivated Hellene, we see that he has very little Christianity about him. He is Christian in form, as a Persian is Mussulman, but at bottom he is "Hellenist." His religion is the adoration of the ancient Greek genius. He pardons every heresy to the philhellene, to him who admires his past. He is much less the disciple of Jesus and St. Paul than of Plutarch and Julian.

Tired with his want of success in Athens, Paul, without awaiting the return of Timothy,¹¹² set out for Corinth. He had not established an extensive church at Athens.¹¹³ Only a few isolated persons, among others a certain Dionysius, a member it is said of the Areopagus,¹¹⁴ and a woman named Damaris,¹¹⁵ had adhered to his doctrines. This was the first and almost the only check he met with in his apostolic career.

Even in the second century, the church of Athens lacks stability.¹¹⁶ Athens was one of the last cities to be converted.¹¹⁷ Next to Constantine, it was the second in opposition to Christianity, a bulwark of philosophy.¹¹⁸ By a rare privilege, it kept its temples undisturbed. These prodigious monuments, preserved for ages, thanks to a sort of instinctive respect, were destined to come down to us as an eternal lesson of good sense and honesty given by artists of genius. Still in our day we feel that the layer of Christianity which covers the old Pagan basis is here very superficial. There is scarcely need of modifying the actual names of the churches of Athens in order to discover those of the antique temples.¹¹⁹

CHAPTER VIII.

CONTINUATION OF THE SECOND JOURNEY OF PAUL. — FIRST
SOJOURN AT CORINTH.

PAUL, having set out from Phaleria or from the Piræus, landed at Cenchrea, which was the port of Corinth on the Egean sea. It is quite a good little harbor, surrounded by green hills and pine forests,¹ at the head of the Saronic gulf. A beautiful valley, nearly two leagues² in width, leads from this port to the great city built at the foot of the colossal dome from which the two seas are visible.

Corinth³ offered a field much better prepared than Athens to receive the new seed. It was not, like Athens, a sort of sanctuary of the mind, a city sacred and unique in the world. It was scarcely a Hellenic city.⁴ Old Corinth had been utterly destroyed by Mummius. For a hundred years, the soil of the Achaian league was a desert.⁵ In the year 44 B. C., Julius Cæsar rebuilt the city, and made an important Roman colony of it, peopling it with freedmen.⁶ That is sufficient to say that its population was very mixed.⁷ It was composed of a collection of those people, of all sorts and origins, who liked Cæsar. The new Corinthians remained for a long while strangers to Greece, where they were regarded as intruders.⁸ They had for amusements the brutal games of the Romans, repulsive to the true Greeks.⁹ Thus Corinth became, like so many others on the borders of the Mediterranean, a very populous city,¹⁰ — rich, brilliant, frequented by numerous strangers, centre of an active commerce; in a word, one of those mixed cities which were no longer native lands. The characteristic feature which rendered its name proverbial was the extreme corruption of manners displayed there.¹¹ In this respect, again, it constituted an exception among the Hellenic cities. The true Greek

manners were simple and gay. They could in no wise pass for luxurious and corrupt.¹² The multitude of sailors drawn together by the two ports had made Corinth the last sanctuary of Venus Pandemos, — a remnant of the ancient Phenician establishments.¹³ The great temple of Venus contained more than a thousand sacred courtesans. The entire city was like a vast evil resort, where numerous strangers, above all sailors, went to spend their fortunes foolishly.¹⁴

There was a colony of Jews at Corinth,¹⁵ probably established at Cenchrea, — that one of the ports which was engaged in commerce with the Orient.¹⁶ A short time before Paul's arrival, there had landed a band of Jews driven out of Rome by the edict of Claudius, and having among their number Aquila and Priscilla, who already at this period, it appears, professed the faith of Christ.¹⁷ From all this there resulted a very favorable conjuncture of circumstances. The isthmus formed between the two main portions of the Greek continent has always been the centre of an universal commerce. Here also there was one of those *emporion*,¹⁸ without any regard to race and nationality, destined to be the *bureaus*, if I may presume to express myself so, of growing Christianity. New Corinth, precisely on account of its small number of Hellenic nobility, was already a half Christian city. With Antioch, Ephesus, Thessalonica, and Rome, it will be an ecclesiastical metropolis of the highest rank. But the immorality which existed there, might, at the same time, lead us to conjecture that the first abuses in the history of the church would take place there. In a few years, Corinth will present us a spectacle of incestuous Christians and drunken people seated at the table of Christ.

Paul quickly saw that it would be necessary for him to remain a long while in Corinth. Therefore he resolved to establish himself permanently there, and to work at his trade as tent-maker. Now Aquila and Priscilla followed precisely the same calling as himself. He therefore went to live with them, and the three established a little shop, which they filled with articles wrought by themselves.¹⁹

Timothy, whom he had sent from Athens to Thessalonica, soon rejoined him. The news from the church of Thessalonica was excellent. All the faithful were persevering in faith and charity, and in attachment to their master. The vexations of their fellow-citizens had not shaken them.²⁰ Their beneficent action had extended over all Macedonia.²¹ Silas, whom Paul had not seen since his flight from Berea, probably joined Timothy and returned with him. Certain it is that the three companions found themselves reunited in Corinth, and lived there a long while together.²²

The efforts of Paul, as usual, were first directed toward the Jews. Each Sabbath, he spoke in the synagogue.²³ He found very diverse dispositions there. One family, that of Stephane-phorus, or Stephanas, was converted, and all its members baptized by Paul.²⁴ The orthodox ones resisted energetically; and it terminated in insults and blasphemy. Finally, one day the rupture became complete. Paul shook off the dust of his clothes upon the unbelievers present, made them responsible for the consequences, and declared that, since they closed their ears to the truth, he would go to the Gentiles. Having said these words, he left the room. Henceforth, he taught in the house of a certain Titius Justus,²⁵ a devout man, whose house was near to the synagogue. Crispus, the chief ruler of the Jewish community, became a partisan of Paul's. He was converted, together with his whole household, and Paul baptized him himself, — a thing which he did rarely.²⁶

Many others of the Jews, heathens, or "those fearing God," were baptized. The number of converted heathen appears to have been very large here.²⁷ Paul displayed a wonderful zeal. Divine visions appeared to him by night to strengthen him.²⁸ The report of the conversions which he had made at Thessalonica had, moreover, preceded him, and favorably disposed the pious society toward him²⁹. Supernatural phenomena were not wanting; ³⁰ there were miracles performed.³¹ Here, innocence was not the same as at Philippi and Thessalonica. The bad

morals of Corinth sometimes crossed the threshold of the church. At least, all those who entered it were not equally pure. But, as an offset, few churches were more numerous. The community of Corinth branched out through the entire province of Achaia,³² and became the home of Christianity in the Hellenic peninsula. Without mentioning Aquila and Priscilla, who almost rank as apostles, Titius Justus, Crispus, or Stephanas, already spoken of, the church numbered among its members Gaius, who was likewise baptized by Paul, and at whose house the apostle sojourned upon his second visit to Corinth; Quartus, Achaicus, Fortunatus, Erastus, — quite an important personage, — treasurer of the city, — and a lady named Chloe, who had a numerous household.³³ We have only vague and uncertain information of a certain Zenas, a Jewish lawyer.³⁴ Stephanas and his house formed the most influential group, the one of most authority.³⁵ All the converts, in a word, if we except Erastus, were ordinary people, without great instruction or social distinction, — in a word, belonging to the lowest classes.³⁶

The port of Cenchrea also had its church. Cenchrea was inhabited principally by orientals.³⁷ Isis and Eschmoun were worshipped here. The Phenician Venus was not neglected.³⁸ It was, like Kalamaki in our day, less a city than a heap of shops and inns for sailors. In the midst of the degradation of these low mariners' retreats, Christianity performed its miracle. Cenchrea had an admirable deaconess, who, one day, as we shall afterward see, concealed under the folds of her robe the whole future of the Christian theology — the writing which was to regulate the fate of the world. Her name was Phebe. She was an active, stirring person, always eager to render service, and who was very dear to Paul.³⁹

Paul's sojourn at Corinth lasted eighteen months.⁴⁰ The beautiful rock of Acro-Corinth, the white summits of Helicon and Parnassus, refreshed his gaze for a long while. Paul contracted profound friendships in this new religious family ;

although the taste of the Greeks for disputation displeased him, and more than once his natural timidity must have been increased by the inclination of his auditors to subtlety.⁴¹ He could not keep his thoughts from Thessalonica, from the simplicity which he had found there, the warm affection which he had left there. The church of Thessalonica was the model of which he did not cease to preach,⁴² and to which he always made allusion. Nor did the church at Philippi, with its pious women, its rich and good Lydian, allow itself to be forgotten. This church, as we have seen, enjoyed a singular privilege, that of maintaining the apostle, when his labor failed to do so. At Corinth, he again received assistance from her. As if the somewhat trifling nature of the Corinthians, and of the Greeks in general, had inspired him with distrust, he did not wish to be indebted to them in this respect, although more than once he had found himself in need during his sojourn among them.⁴³

It was difficult, nevertheless, for the displeasure of the orthodox Jews, still so active, not to give rise to some disturbance. The preaching of the apostle to the Gentiles, his broad principles concerning the adoption of all those who should believe, and their incorporation into the family of Abraham, irritated to the highest degree the partisans of the exclusive privilege of the children of Israel. The apostle, on his side, often berated them in the severest terms. He announced that the wrath of God was going to burst upon them.⁴⁴ The Jews had recourse to Roman authority. Corinth was the capital of the province of Achaia, comprising all Greece, and what was generally united to Macedonia. The two provinces had been rendered senatorial by Claudius,⁴⁵ and as such they had a proconsul. At the period now under consideration, this office was filled by one of the most genial and best instructed personages of the century, Marcus Annæus Novatus, eldest brother of Seneca, who had been adopted by the rhetorician, L. Junius Gallio, one of the *litterateurs* of the society of the Senecas.⁴⁶ Marcus Annæus Novatus took the name of Gallio. He was a man of fine mind

and noble soul, the friend of the poets and celebrated writers.⁴⁷ All those that knew him worshipped him. Statius called him *dulcis Gallio*; and perhaps he is the author of some of the tragedies which proceeded from this literary *cænaculum*. He wrote, it appears, upon natural questions.⁴⁸ His brother dedicated to him his books on *Anger* and the *Happy Life*. They attributed to him one of the most witty sayings of the period.⁴⁹ It appears that it was his extensive Hellenic culture which caused him to be chosen, under the lettered Claudius, for the administration of the province which all governments, at all enlightened, overwhelmed with delicate attentions.⁵⁰ His health obliged him to abandon this position. Like his brother, he had the honor, under Nero, of atoning by death for his distinction and uprightness.⁵¹

Such a man must have been little inclined to receive the demands of fanatics, coming to ask the civil power against which they protest in secret to free them of their enemies. One day, Sosthenes, the new chief of the synagogue, who had succeeded Crispus, led Paul before the tribunal, accusing him of preaching a religion contrary to the law.⁵² In fact, Judaism, which had its old privileges and all sorts of guarantees, pretended that the dissenting sect, so soon as it separated from the synagogue, no longer enjoyed the rights of the synagogue. The situation was the same as that the liberal Protestants in French law would have, the moment they should separate themselves from recognized Protestantism. Paul was going to reply, when Gallio stopped him, and, turning to the Jews, said, "If it were a matter of wrong, or wicked lewdness, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge of such matters."⁵³ An admirable reply!—worthy to be a model to civil governments, when they are invited to meddle with religious questions. Gallio, after having given it, ordered both parties to be driven away. A great tumult took place. Everybody, as if vying with one another, fell upon Sosthenes, and began to beat him

before the judgment-seat. It was impossible to tell where the blows came from.⁵¹ Gallio took no notice of it, and had the place cleared. The politic sage had avoided interfering in a quarrel of dogma, — the well-bred man refused to mingle in a dispute among vulgar people. And as soon as he saw them beginning to use violence, he sent them all away.

Assuredly it would have been wiser not to manifest so much disdain. Gallio was well inspired in declaring himself incompetent in a question of schism and heresy. But how little foresight men of intelligence sometimes have ! At a later period, it was found that the quarrel of these abject sectarians was the great question of the century. If, instead of treating the religious and social question in this off-hand manner, the government had given itself the trouble to institute a thoroughly impartial investigation ; to establish a solid public instruction, and not continue to give official sanction to a religion which had become completely absurd ; if Gallio had been willing to have explained to him what a Jew and a Christian were, to read the Jewish books, and keep himself posted on what was taking place in this subterranean world ; if the Romans had not had such narrow and such unscientific minds ; — many misfortunes might have been prevented. Strange thing ! Here are, face to face, on the one hand, one of the most intelligent and inquisitive men ; on the other, one of the strongest and most original souls of his day ; and they pass in front of each other without coming in contact ; and surely, if the blows had fallen upon Paul, instead of Sosthenes, Gallio would have manifested equal indifference. One of the things which make people of the world commit most errors is that slight feeling of repulsiveness excited within them by badly-bred or ill-mannered persons ; for manners are only a matter of form, and those who have none sometimes find themselves in the right. The man of society, with his frivolous dislikes, almost always passes unconsciously by the man who is about to create the future. They are not of the same world ;

for the common mistake of society people, is to imagine that the world that they see is the whole world.

These difficulties, however, were not the only ones the apostle encountered. The mission of Corinth was troubled by obstacles which he met for the first time in his apostolic career, — obstacles arising from the interior of the church itself, — intractable men, who had gained admittance there, and who resisted him ; or rather Jews, drawn towards Jesus, but less freed than Paul from the legal observances.⁵⁵ The false spirit of the degenerate Greek, which, dating from the fourth century, so materially altered Christianity, already manifested itself. Then the apostle recollected his dear churches of Macedonia, — that unlimited gentleness, that purity of morals, that frank cordiality, which, at Philippi and Thessalonica had afforded him such happy days. He was seized with a strong desire to revisit his faithful ones of the north ; and, when he received from them an expression of the same desires, he could scarcely restrain himself.⁵⁶ In order to afford himself consolation in the troubles and importunities of the world which surrounded him, he took pleasure in writing to them. The epistles dated from Corinth are tinged with a certain sadness, flattering in the highest degree for those to whom Paul wrote. These letters are either completely silent, or else contain a few unfavorable allusions⁵⁷ in regard to those from whose midst they are written.

CHAPTER IX.

CONTINUATION OF THE SECOND JOURNEY OF PAUL. — FIRST
EPISTLES. — INTERIOR STATE OF THE NEW CHURCHES.

IT was at Corinth that the apostolic life of Paul attained its highest degree of activity. To the cares of the great Christendom which he was occupied in founding were joined the pre-occupation in respect to the communities which he had left behind him. A sort of jealousy (as he says himself)¹ was preying upon him. He thought less, at this moment, of establishing new churches, than of watching over those which he had formed. Each one of his churches was for him like a bride which he had promised to Christ, and whom he wished to keep pure.² The power which he assumed over these corporations was absolute. A certain number of rules which he regarded as having been established by Jesus himself were the only canonical rights anterior to him that he recognized. He regarded himself divinely inspired to add to these rules all those demanded by the new circumstances through which they had to pass.³ Was not his example, moreover, a supreme rule to which all his spiritual sons were to conform?⁴

Timothy, whom he employed to visit the distant churches, could not, had he been indefatigable, satisfy the unlimited ardor of his master. It was then that Paul conceived the idea of supplying by correspondence what was impossible for him to do by himself or by his principal disciples. There existed in the Roman Empire nothing which resembled our establishment of post-offices for private letters; all correspondence took place as opportunity offered itself, or by messenger.⁵ Therefore St. Paul adopted the habit of taking with him everywhere persons of a second order, who served him as couriers. There already existed correspondence among synagogues in Judaism. The

messenger appointed to carry the letters was even a suborned dignitary from the synagogues. Epistolary style formed, among the Jews,⁶ a species of literature which they preserved quite up to the middle ages,⁷ as a consequence of their dispersion. Without doubt Christian epistles were in existence from the epoch in which Christianity spread itself throughout all Syria ; but in the hands of Paul, these writings, which up to that time had not been generally preserved, were, as much as the word, the instrument of the progress of the Christian faith. It was held that the authority of the epistles equalled that of the apostle himself;⁸ each of them was to be read before the assembled church;⁹ some of them even had the character of circular letters, and were communicated successively to several churches.¹⁰ The reading of the correspondence thus became an essential part of the Sunday service, and it was not only at the moment of its receipt that the letter thus served for the edification of the brethren. Filed in the archives of the church, it was taken out on the days of reunion, to be read as a sacred document, and a perpetual precept.¹¹ The epistle was thus the form of primitive Christian literature,—an admirable form, perfectly appropriate to the condition of the period, and to the natural aptitudes of Paul.

In fact, the condition of the new sect in no wise permitted connected books.¹² Young Christianity was entirely freed from texts. The hymns themselves proceeded from every one, and were not written. They believed themselves to be on the eve of the final catastrophe. The sacred books, those which they called the Scriptures, were the books of the ancient law. Jesus had not added any new book to them. He was to come, in order to fulfil the ancient Scriptures and to begin an age in which he himself would be the living book. Letters of consolation and encouragement were all that could be produced in such a condition of mind. If already toward the period to which we have arrived there were a number of little books, destined to freshen the memory concerning the “sayings and doings of Jesus,” these

little books had an entirely private character. They were not authentic, official writings, universally received in the community. They were notes on which those persons acquainted with the subject laid little value, and which they considered entirely inferior to tradition in matter of authority.¹³

Paul, on his side, had a mind in no wise inclined to composing books. He had not the patience in order to write. He was incapable of system; labor with the pen was disagreeable to him, and he liked to put it off upon others.¹⁴ Correspondence, on the contrary, so disagreeable to writers accustomed to set forth their ideas artistically, was well adapted to his feverish activity, to his need of expressing his impressions on the spot. At times animated, harsh, polished, malicious, sarcastic; then suddenly tender, delicate, almost roguish and cajoling, with the expression happy and fine to the highest degree; skillful in varying his style with reticences, reservations, infinite precautions, malicious allusions, dissembled ironies, he was destined to excel in a style which, above all, exacts impulse. The epistolary style of Paul is the most personal that ever existed. His language is, if I dare express myself so, hackled, not a connected phrase. It is impossible to more boldly violate, I do not say the genius of the Greek language, but the logic of the human language. One would say it is a rapid conversation, stenographically reported, and reproduced without correction. Timothy soon fitted himself to perform the duties of a secretary to his master, and as his language must have resembled Paul's somewhat, he frequently took his place.

It is probable that in the epistles and perhaps in the Acts, there are pages by Timothy. Such was the modesty of this rare man that we have no certain sign whereby to detect them.

Even when Paul corresponded directly, he did not write with his own hand: he dictated.¹⁵ Sometimes when the letter was finished he re-read it. Then his impetuous soul got the better of him. He made marginal additions to it, at the risk of injuring the context, and producing detached or entangled phrases.¹⁶ He

sent the letter thus altered, without giving a thought to the innumerable repetitions of words and ideas which it contained. With his wonderful warmth of soul, Paul has a singular poverty of expression. A word besets him :¹⁷ he introduces it into a page at every turn. It is not barrenness, it is the vehemence of mind, and a perfect indifference as to the correctness of style. In order to avoid the numerous fabrications to which the passions of the times, the authority of the apostle, and the material conditions of ancient epistolography¹⁸ gave occasion, Paul was accustomed to send to the churches a specimen of his handwriting, which was easily to be recognized ;¹⁹ after which it was sufficient for him, according to general usage, to put at the end of his letters a few words in his handwriting, as guarantee of authenticity.²⁰

No doubt Paul's correspondence was considerable, and that what we possess of it is but a small portion.²¹ The religion of the primitive churches was so distinct from all matter, so purely idealistic, that they never thought of the immense price of these writings. The faith was everything ; each one carried it in his heart, and cared little for the loose sheets of papyrus,²² which, besides, were not autographic.

These epistles were for the most part writings for the occasion. No one ever imagined that they would one day become sacred books. It is not till toward the end of the apostle's life that there is question of holding to his letters for their own value, being contented with them, and preserving them. Each church then keeps her own carefully, consults them often,²³ reads them regularly,²⁴ and allows them to be copied ;²⁵ but a large number of letters of the first period were irretrievably lost. As to the letters or replies of the churches,²⁶ all of them have disappeared, and it could not be otherwise. Paul, in his wandering life, never had other archives than his memory and his heart.

Only two letters of the second mission have reached us : they are the two epistles to the church of Thessalonica.²⁷ Paul wrote them from Corinth,²⁸ and associated the names of Silas and

Timothy with his in the superscription. They must have been composed at a short interval from each other.²⁹ They are two writings, full of unction, tenderness, emotion, and charm. The apostle does not hide his preference for the churches of Macedonia. To express this love, he makes use of the most vivid expressions, the most tender images. He represents himself as the nurse warming her nurslings in her bosom;³⁰ as a father watching over his children.³¹ This is what Paul was, in reality, for the churches which he had founded. Paul was an admirable missionary, but he was, above all, an admirable director of consciences. Never did a man understand himself better as a keeper of souls. Never was the problem of the education of man grasped in a livelier and more intimate manner. Do not think that this ascendant was won by flattery, by gentleness.³² No; Paul was churlish, ugly, at times passionate. He in no wise resembled Jesus. He had not his charming indulgence, his way of overlooking everything; his divine incapacity of seeing evil. Frequently he was imperious, and caused his authority to be felt with an ascendancy that shocks us.³³ He commands; he blames severely; he speaks of himself with assurance,³⁴ and proposes himself as a model without any hesitation.³⁵ But what loftiness! What purity! What disinterestedness! With respect to the last, he goes to extremes. Ten times he returns with pride to the detail, apparently childish, that he has cost nothing to any one; that he has not eaten any one's bread *gratis*; that he works night and day like an artisan, although he might have done like the other apostles, and lived from the altar. The motive of his zeal was a love for souls, in some respects without limit or bound.

The happiness, the innocence, the fraternal spirit, the boundless charity of these primitive churches afford a spectacle never to recur again.³⁶ All this was spontaneous, without restraint; and yet these little associations were as solid as iron. Not only did they resist the perpetual bickering of the Jews,³⁷ but their interior organizations were of a surprising strength. In order

to form an idea of them, we must call to mind, not our large churches, open to all; but religious orders, with a very strict life of their own; very restricted brotherhoods, in which members come into contact, arouse each other, dispute together, love each other, and hate each other at every moment. These churches had a certain hierarchy;³³ the oldest, the most active members, those who had been in connection with the apostle, enjoyed precedence;³⁹ but the apostle himself was the first to reject everything which would have resembled a mastership. He only wished to be "promoter of the common joy."⁴⁰

The "elders"⁴¹ were sometimes elected by voice, that is to say, by raising the hand;⁴² sometimes established by the apostle,⁴³ but always considered as chosen by the Holy Spirit;⁴⁴ that is to say, by that superior instinct which directed the church in all its acts. They already began to call them "overseers" (*episcopi*),⁴⁵ a word which from the political language had passed into the societies,⁴⁶ and to consider them as "pastors" commissioned to conduct the church.⁴⁷ Certain ones, moreover, were regarded as having a sort of specialty for imparting instruction. These were the catechists, going from house to house, and spreading the word of God in private lessons. Paul established the rule that, at least in certain cases,⁴⁸ the catechumen should during instruction share all he possessed in common with his catechist.

The full authority belonged to the assembled church. This authority extended to what was most intimate in private life. All the brethren watched over each other, reproved each other. The assembled church, or at least those whom they called "the spiritual," reprimanded those who were in fault, consoled the discouraged, performed the duty of directors skilful and well-versed in the knowledge of the heart.⁴⁹ Public penitences had not yet been instituted, but doubtless were already in existence in the germ.⁵⁰ As no exterior force was exerted upon the faithful to prevent them from dividing or abandoning the church, one might think that such an organization which would appear intolerable to us, in which we would only see an organized system

of espionage and information, would have quickly worked its own destruction. Nothing of the sort. We do not see at the period now under consideration a single instance of apostasy.⁵¹ All submitted humbly to the sentence of the church. He whose conduct was irregular, or who deviated from the tradition of the apostle, who did not obey his letters, was branded. They shunned him; they had no connection with him. They did not treat him as an enemy, but they warned him as a brother.⁵² This isolation covered him with shame, and he returned.⁵³ The gayety in these little unions of good people, living together, always sprightly, occupied, affectionate, loving much and hating much, — the gayety, I repeat, was very great.⁵⁴ Truly the word of Jesus was fulfilled, the reign of the mild and simple-hearted had come, and manifested itself by an overflowing beatitude which inundated every heart.

They looked with horror upon heathenism,⁵⁵ but were very tolerant in their forms for the heathen.⁵⁶ Far from shunning them, they strove to attract and gain them over.⁵⁷ Many of the faithful had been idolaters, or had idolatrous parents. They knew with what good faith they could remain in error. They remembered their virtuous ancestors, who had died without knowing the truth which saveth. A touching practice — baptism of the dead — was the consequence of this sentiment. They thought that by having themselves baptized for those gone before them without having received the holy water, they would confer upon them the merits of the sacrament.⁵⁸ They thus allowed themselves to hope that they would not be separated from those whom they had loved. A profound idea of intimate union took possession of everybody. The son was saved by his parents, the father by the son, the husband by his wife.⁵⁹ They could not resign themselves to condemn a man of good intentions, or one who in some way or other held to the saints.

Their morality was severe,⁶⁰ but not melancholy. That tiresome virtue which the rigorists of modern times (the Jansenists, Methodists, etc.) preach for Christian virtue was in no respect

that of this period. The relations between men and women, far from being forbidden, were increased.⁶¹ One of the railleries of the heathen was to represent the Christians as effeminate, deserting ordinary society for the conventicles of young girls, old women, and children.⁶² Heathen nudities were severely condemned. Women in general were closely veiled. None of the cares of a timid chastity were omitted.⁶³ But chastity is also a voluptuousness; and the dream of the ideal which is in man, is susceptible of a thousand applications. When we read the acts of St. Perpetua, the legend of St. Dorothea, we find there heroines of an absolute purity; but how little they resemble a nun of Port Royal! Here one-half of the instincts of humanity are suppressed; there these instincts, which later were to be regarded as Satanic suggestions, merely received a new direction. It may be said that primitive Christianity was a sort of moral romanticism, an energetic revulsion of the faculty of love. Christianity did not diminish this faculty; it did not take any precaution against it; it nourished it with air and light. The danger of this boldness did not reveal itself yet. Evil was in the church in some way impossible; for the root of evil, which is wicked desire, had been taken out.

The duties of catechist were often fulfilled by women.⁶⁴ Virginité was regarded as a state of sanctity.⁶⁵ This preference given to celibacy was not a denial of love and beauty, as it was in the harsh and ignorant asceticism of late centuries. It was in women that just and true feeling, that virtue and beauty are worth more the more they are hidden; so much so, that she who has not found this rare pearl of great love keeps, through a sort of pride and reserve, her beauty and her moral perfection for God alone,—for God, regarded as jealous, as the copartner of intimate secrets. Second marriages, without being forbidden, were regarded as a wrong.⁶⁶ The popular sentiment of the century was in accordance with this. The beautiful and touching expression of *σὺμβίος* became the ordinary word for “spouse.”⁶⁷ The words *Virginus*, *Virginia*, *Παρθενιός*, indicating spouses

who had had no other alliance,⁶⁸ became terms of praise and tenderness. The family feeling, the union of husband and wife, their reciprocal esteem, the gratitude of the husband for the cares and foresight of his wife, are embodied in a touching manner in Jewish inscriptions,⁶⁹ which in this respect did nothing more than reflect the sentiment of the humble classes in which Christian propaganda was recruiting its adepts. Singular circumstance! The most elevated ideas concerning the sanctity of marriage were spread through the world by a people among whom polygamy has never been universally forbidden.⁷⁰ But it must have been that in the fraction of Jewish society in which Christianity established itself, polygamy was abolished in reality, since we never see the church imagining that such an enormity needed to be condemned.

Charity, brotherly love, was the supreme law common to all the churches, and to all the schools.⁷¹ Charity and chastity were pre-eminently Christian virtues, — those which gave success to the new preaching, and converted the whole world. The command was to do good to all; nevertheless, the co-religionists were acknowledged worthy of preference.⁷² The taste for labor was esteemed a virtue. Paul, like a good workman, energetically blamed idleness and sloth, and frequently repeated that naive proverb of a man of the people, that, “he who would not work should not eat.”⁷³ The model which he conceived was a punctual, quiet artisan, diligent at work, eating peacefully, and with his heart in repose, the bread which he earned.⁷⁴ How far we are from the primitive ideal of the church of Jerusalem entirely communistic and cenobitic, or even from that of Antioch, entirely occupied with the prophecies and supernatural gifts of the apostolate!

Then the church was an association of honest workmen, gay, satisfied, not envying the rich because they are the happier, because they know that God does not judge like the worldly, and that he prefers the hard and honest hand to the soft hand of the intriguer. One of the principal virtues is to conduct your

own affairs well, "that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may lack of nothing."⁷⁵ Several members of the church, of whom St. Paul had heard "that they do not work at all, but are busybodies," are severely blamed.⁷⁶ This alliance between practical good sense and illuminism should never surprise any one. Does not the English race in Europe and America offer us the same contrast, so full of good sense in things of the world, but so absurd in spiritual affairs? Quakerism in the same way commenced by being a tissue of absurdities, until that period in which, through the influences of William Penn, it became something practically great and fruitful.

The supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as prophecy, were not neglected.⁷⁷ But we see well, that in the churches of Greece, composed of non-Jews, these fantastic exercises had no longer much sense, and we can imagine that they were soon to fall into disuse. The Christian discipline inclined toward a deistic piety, consisting in serving the true God, praying, and doing good.⁷⁸ Unbounded hope gave to these precepts of pure religion the efficacy which they never would have possessed through themselves. The dream which had been the soul of the movement of ideas brought about by Jesus continued to be the fundamental dogma of Christianity: everybody believed in the speedy coming of the kingdom of God, in the unexpected manifestation of a great glory, in the midst of which the Son of God would appear. The idea they had of this wonderful phenomenon was the same as that in the time of Jesus. "A great wrath," that is to say, a terrible catastrophe, is near at hand. This catastrophe will strike all those whom Jesus shall not have delivered. Jesus will show himself in the heavens, as "the Lord of glory,"⁷⁹ surrounded by angels.⁸⁰ Then the judgment will take place. The saints, the persecuted, will be gathered round Jesus, to enjoy with him an eternal repose. The unbelievers who have persecuted them, especially the Jews, will be burned. Their punishment will be eternal death; driven from before Jesus, they will be dragged down into the abyss of destruction.

A consuming fire, in fact, will be lighted, and will destroy the world and all those who shall have rejected the Gospel of Jesus. This final catastrophe will be a sort of great and glorious manifestation of Jesus and of his saints, an act of supreme justice, a tardy reparation for the iniquities which have constituted until now the law of the age.⁸¹

Objections were naturally raised against this strange doctrine. One of the principal ones arose from the difficulty of conceiving the fate of the dead, in the moment of the coming of Jesus. Since the writing from Paul, there had been several deaths in the church of Thessalonica. These first deaths caused a profound impression. Should they pity and regard as excluded from the kingdom of God those who had thus disappeared before the solemn hour? The ideas concerning individual immortality and particular judgments, were still too little developed in order that such an objection could be raised.⁸² Paul replied to it with remarkable precision. Death will only be the sleep of a moment.

“But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if ye believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout; with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words.”⁸³

They strove to calculate the day of this great appearance. St. Paul blames these inquisitive inquiries, and in order to show their emptiness, makes use of almost the same words attributed to Jesus.⁸⁴

“But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves, know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, peace and plenty, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day shall overcome you as a thief.⁶⁵ Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore, let us not sleep as do others; but let us watch and be sober.”⁶⁶

The anticipation of this coming catastrophe was very great. Enthusiasts believed to know the date of it by particular revelations. There were already Apocalypses. They even went so far as to circulate false letters from the apostle, in which this end was announced.

“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together under him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing that he is God.⁶⁷ Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what he withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this

cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."⁸⁸

It will be seen that in these texts, written twenty years after the death of Christ, a single essential element has been added to the picture of the day of the Lord, such as Jesus conceived it;⁸⁹ namely, the *rôle* of an *anti-Christ*,⁹⁰ or "false-Christ," who was to rise before the great coming of Jesus himself,—a sort of messiah from Satan, who will perform miracles, and will seek to have himself worshipped. While speaking of Simon the magician, we have already met with the singular idea, that the false prophets performed miracles like the true ones.⁹¹ The opinion that the judgment of God would be preceded by terrible catastrophes, by a flood of impiety and abominations, by the temporary triumph of idolatry, by the coming of a sacrilegious king, was moreover very ancient, and dated from the first origin of the Apocalyptic doctrines.⁹² Little by little this ephemeral reign of evil, announcing the final victory of the good, assumed among the Christians the type of a man whom they conceived to be the exact inverse of Jesus,—a sort of Christ of hell.

The type of this future seducer was composed in part of recollections of Antiochus Epiphanes, such as the book of Daniel⁹³ represented him, combined with reminiscences of Balaam, of Gog and Magog, Nebuchadnezzar, and in part of features derived from the circumstances of the period. The frightful tragedy Rome was playing at this moment before the world could not fail to exalt many imaginations. Caligula, the anti-god, the first emperor who wished to be worshipped while alive, probably inspired Paul with the idea that the said personage would raise himself above all the pretended gods, all the idols, and would sit down in the temple of Jerusalem, striving to pass himself off for God himself.⁹⁴ Thus the anti-Christ is conceived, in the year 54, as a continuator of the sacrilegious madness of Caligula. The reality will only afford too many opportunities to explain such forebodings. A few months after

Paul had written that strange page, Nero succeeded to the empire. It is in him that the Christian conscience, at a later period, will see the monster precursory to the coming of Christ. What this cause is, or rather, who this personage is, that in the year 54, according to St. Paul, still prevented the time of the anti-Christ from arriving, is a question which remains wrapped up in obscurity. There is question here probably of a mysterious secret, not foreign to politics, of which the faithful spoke among themselves, but of which they never wrote for fear of compromising themselves.⁹⁵ One letter seized would have sufficed to bring about atrocious persecutions. Here, as upon other points, the custom of the primitive Christians not to write certain things, creates for us irremediable obscurities. It has been supposed that the person in question is the Emperor Claudius, and they have detected in an expression of Paul a play upon words on his name (*Claudius*—*qui claudit*—ὁ κατέχων). In fact, at the date in which this letter was written, the death of poor Claudius, entangled in fatal meshes by the wretch Agrippina, must have appeared to be only a question of time. Every one was expecting it: the emperor himself was speaking of it. Sombre presentiments arose on all sides; prodigies of nature, such as those which fourteen years later so strongly impressed the author of the Apocalypse, were besetting the popular imagination. They spoke with dread of monstrous fœtuses,—of a sow which bore a young one with hawk's claws.⁹⁶ All this made them tremble for the future. The Christians, like people of the lower classes, participated in these terrors. The omens, and the superstitious fear of natural plagues, prompted the essential motives of the Apocalyptic beliefs.⁹⁷

What is clear, what again shines forth for us in these invaluable documents, what explains to us the unheard of success of Christian propaganda, is the spirit of devotion, of high morality, which reigned in these churches. One can imagine them to himself as reunions of Moravian brethren, or of pietistic protestants, practising the most fervent devotion; or else as a sort of

third order of the Catholic congregation. Prayer, and the name of Jesus, were always on the lips of the faithful⁹⁸ before every action; before a meal, for instance, they pronounced a benediction, or a short return of grace.⁹⁹ It was regarded as an injury done to the church to bring a suit before a civil judge.¹⁰⁰ The belief in a speedy destruction of the world robbed the revolutionary ferment, at work in every mind, of a great portion of its sharpness. The constant rule of the apostle was, that one should remain in the calling to which he had been called: if circumcised, not to dissimulate the circumcision; if uncircumcised, not to have circumcision performed; if a virgin, to remain a virgin; if married, to remain married; if a slave, not to think anything about it, and even if possible to gain one's liberty, to remain a slave.¹⁰¹ "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant."¹⁰² A boundless resignation took possession of souls, rendered everything indifferent, and consigned all the sorrows of this world to burial and forgetfulness.

The church was a permanent source of edification and consolation. We must not judge of the Christian reunions of this period by the ceremonious assemblies of our day, in which nothing unexpected or aught of individual action constitutes any part.¹⁰³ We should rather call to mind the conventicles of English Quakers, American Shakers, and French *spirites*. During the reunion, all were seated; each one spoke when the spirit moved him. Then the inspired one arose,¹⁰⁴ and pronounced, upon the impulse of the spirit, discourses of divers forms, which it is now difficult for us to distinguish, — psalms, canticles, returns of grace, eulogies, prophecies, revelations, lessons, exhortations, consolations, exercises in glossology.¹⁰⁵ These improvisations, considered as Divine oracles,¹⁰⁶ were sometimes sung, and sometimes pronounced in a plain manner.¹⁰⁷ They called upon each other for this purpose reciprocally. Each one excited the enthusiasm of the others. It was what they called "singing to the Lord."¹⁰⁸ The women kept silent.¹⁰⁹ As they all believed themselves

unceasingly visited by the spirit, every image, every sound which entered the brain of the believers appeared to contain a profound meaning; and, with the best faith in the world, their souls received pure nourishment from pure illusions. After each eulogy, each prayer thus improvised, the congregation united with the inspired one by the word "*Amen*."¹¹⁹ To mark the divers acts of the mysterious sitting, the chief interposed either by the invitation, *Oremus*; or, with a sigh towards heaven, *Sursum corda*; or, in recollecting that Jesus, according to his promise, is in the midst of the assembly, *Dominus vobiscum*.¹¹¹ The cry of *Kyrie eleison* was also frequently repeated, with a suppliant and plaintive rhythm.¹¹²

Prophecy was a gift highly prized.¹¹³ Sometimes women were endowed with it.¹¹⁴ In many cases, especially when there was a question of glossology, they hesitated; they were sometimes even fearful of being the dupes of a deception of evil spirits. One particular class of the inspired, or as they called them "*spiritual*,"¹¹⁵ were commissioned to interpret these strange eruptions, and to discover their meaning, and to discern the spirits from whence they proceeded.¹¹⁶ These phenomena were very efficacious in converting the heathen, and were considered as the most demonstrative miracles.¹¹⁷ In fact, the heathen, or at least those whom they supposed to be friendly, entered the assemblies.¹¹⁸ Then strange scenes often took place. One or more of the inspired ones addressed themselves to the intruder, spoke to him with alternate harshness and mildness, revealed to him the greatest secrets which he supposed to be known to himself alone, unveiled to him the sins of his past life. The wretched one was bewildered, confounded. The shame from this public manifestation, the idea that he had been seen by this assembly in a sort of spiritual nudity, created between him and the brethren a strong tie, one not to be afterwards severed.¹¹⁹ A sort of confession was sometimes the first act performed, upon joining the sect.¹²⁰ The intimacy, the tenderness, established between the brethren and sisters by such exercises was unre-

served; all veritably constituted but one single person. There was nothing else necessary than a perfect spiritualism to prevent such relations from terminating in shocking abuses.

We can conceive what a powerful attraction such an active life of affection must have exercised in the midst of a society destitute of moral ties; above all, among the popular classes, equally neglected by state and religion. There is the great lesson for our century to learn from this history: the times resemble each other; the future will belong to that party which shall take the popular classes and elevate them. But in our day the difficulty is very much greater than it ever has been. In antiquity, on the borders of the Mediterranean, material life could be simple; the wants of the body were secondary, and easily satisfied. With us, these wants are numerous and imperious. Popular associations are held to the earth, as by a leaden weight. It was above all the sacred feast, the "Lord's Supper,"¹²¹ which had a very great moral efficacy. They considered it as a mystical act, by which all were incorporated into Christ, and consequently reunited in the same body. This was a perpetual lesson of equality and fraternity. The sacramental words which they attributed to the Last Supper of Jesus were present to all. They believed that this bread, this wine, and this water, were the flesh and blood of Jesus himself.¹²² Those who partook of it were thought to eat Jesus, to unite themselves to him, and themselves together by an ineffable mystery. They entered upon it by giving each other the "holy kiss," or "kiss of love,"¹²³ without any scruple having come to disturb this innocence of a second golden age. Generally, the men kissed each other, and the women each other.¹²⁴ Some churches, however, carried the holy privilege so far as to make no distinction of sexes in the kiss of love.¹²⁵ Profane society, little capable of understanding such a purity, made it an occasion for divers calumnies. The chaste Christian kiss aroused the suspicions of libertines, and, at an early day, the church bound itself upon this point to strict precautions. But in the begin-

ning this was an essential rite, inseparable from the Eucharist, and completing the high signification of this symbol of peace and love.¹²⁶ Some deprived themselves of it on fast-days, as a sign of mourning and austerity.¹²⁷

The first Cenobitic Church of Jerusalem broke bread every day.¹²⁸ From this, twenty or thirty years after, they came to celebrate the sacred feast only once a week. This celebration took place in the evening,¹²⁹ according to Jewish usage,¹³⁰ by the light of numerous lamps.¹³¹ The day chosen for it was the day after the Sabbath, the first day of the week. They called it the "Lord's Day," in remembrance of the resurrection;¹³² and also because they believed that on that day God had created the world.¹³³ Alms and collections were made on that day.¹³⁴ The Sabbath, which probably all Christians still celebrated in an unequally scrupulous manner, was distinct from the Lord's Day.¹³⁵ But without doubt the day of repose tended more and more to mingle with the Lord's Day, and we are allowed to suppose, that, in the Gentile churches which had no reason to prefer Saturday, this change had already been made.¹³⁶ The *ebionim* of the Orient, on the contrary, rested on Saturday.¹³⁷

Little by little the repast tended to become purely symbolic in form. At the beginning, it was a real supper,¹³⁸ at which every one ate according to his hunger, only with a high mystical intention.¹³⁹ The repast was begun with a prayer. As with the dinners of heathen brotherhoods,¹⁴⁰ each one came with his *sportula*, and consumed what he had brought.¹⁴¹ Without doubt the church furnished the accessories, such as hot water, fish, and what they termed *ministerium*.¹⁴² They took pleasure in imagining two invisible servants, *Ircne* (Peace) and *Agape* (Love), the one pouring out the wine and the other mingling the warm water with it; and perhaps at certain periods in the repast would be heard, with a slight smile to the deaconesses (*ministræ*),¹⁴³ whatever their names may have been—*Irene, da calda*—*Agape, misce mi*,¹⁴⁴ A spirit of gentle reserve and discreet sobriety presided at the feast.¹⁴⁵ The table at which they were seated had

the form of a hollow semi-circle, or of a lunar *sigma*. The elder was placed in the centre.¹⁴⁶ The *patera*, or saucers, used in drinking, were the object of a particular care.¹⁴⁷ The blessed bread and wine were carried to those absent through the agency of the elders.¹⁴⁸

In time, the repast came to be nothing more than one in appearance. They ate at home to satisfy hunger. At the assembly, they only ate a few mouthfuls ; they only drank a few swallows, for the sake of the symbol.¹⁴⁹ They were led by a sort of logic to distinguish the fraternal repast in common, from the mystical act, which only consisted in the breaking of the bread.¹⁵⁰ The breaking of the bread became every day more sacramental. The repast, on the contrary, in proportion as the church enlarged, grew more profane.¹⁵¹ At times the repast was reduced to almost nothing, and by this reduction all the importance was attached to the sacramental act.¹⁵² At other times, the two existed as divisions of each other : the repast was a prelude or a sequel to the Eucharist. They ate together, before or after the communion.¹⁵³ Then the two ceremonies separated entirely. The pious repasts were acts of charity toward the poor, sometimes remnants of heathen usages, and had no longer any connection with the Eucharist.¹⁵⁴ As such, they were, in general, suppressed in the fourth century.¹⁵⁵ The "eulogies," or "hallowed bread," then remained the sole recollection of an age in which the Eucharist had been clothed in more complex and less clearly analyzed forms. For a long time, however, they kept the custom of calling upon the name of Jesus on drinking,¹⁵⁶ and they continued to consider as an eulogy the action of breaking the bread and drinking together.¹⁵⁷ These were the last traces, and slight ones at that, of the admirable institution of Jesus.

The name originally borne by the Eucharistic feasts admirably expressed everything of divine efficacy and salutary morality possessed by this excellent rite. They were called *agapæ*, that is to say, "friendships," or "charities."¹⁵⁸ The Jews, the

Essenes especially, had already attached moral significations to religious festivities ;¹⁵⁹ but in passing into the hands of another race, these oriental usages assumed an almost mythological value. The Mithriac mysteries, which were about to develop themselves in the Roman world, had for a principal rite the offering of the bread and cup, over which certain words were pronounced.¹⁶⁰ The resemblance was such that the Christians explained it by claiming that it was the result of a demon's *ruse*, who must have wished thus to afford himself the infernal pleasure of counterfeiting their most sacred ceremonies.¹⁶¹ The secret connections of all this are very obscure. It was easy to foresee that grave abuses would be quickly mingled with such practices, that some day the repast (the *agape*, properly speaking) would fall into disuse, and that there would only remain the Eucharistic mouthful, as sign and memorial of the primitive institution. One is not surprised either to learn that this strange mystery was the pretext for calumnies, and that the sect which pretended to eat in the form of bread the body and blood of its founder, should be accused of renewing the feasts of Thyestes, of eating children covered with crust, of practising anthropophagy.¹⁶²

The annual festivities were always Jewish ones ; above all, Pass-over and Pentecost.¹⁶³ The Christian Easter was generally celebrated the same day as the Jewish Passover.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the cause which brought about the transfer of the ferial day of each week, from the Sabbath to Sunday, contributed also to regulate Easter, not after the Jewish usage and recollections, but upon the passion and resurrection of Jesus.¹⁶⁵ It is not impossible that this change may have been effected in the churches of Greece and Macedonia while Paul was yet alive. At any rate, the idea of this fundamental *fête* was very greatly modified. The passage of the Red Sea became of little moment in comparison with the resurrection of Jesus. It was no longer thought of, unless it were as containing an image of the triumph of Jesus over death. The true passover is henceforth Jesus, who was offered up for all.

The true unleavened bread is truth, justice ; the old leaven is without virtue, and should be rejected.¹⁶⁶ In a word, the feast of the passover had undergone a similar change of signification much more anciently with the Hebrews. It certainly was a Spring festival in the beginning, which they attached by an artificial etymology to the remembrance of the departure out of Egypt.

Pentecost was also celebrated the same day as by the Jews.¹⁶⁷ Like the passover, this festivity took an entirely new signification, which clouded the old Jewish idea with obscurity. Right or wrong, they imagined that the principal incident of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the assembled apostles had taken place on the day of the Pentecost, which followed the resurrection of Jesus.¹⁶⁸ The ancient harvest-feast of the Semitic race thus became the feast of the Holy Spirit in the new religion. Toward the same time, this festivity underwent with the Jews a similar transformation. It became for them the anniversary of the promulgation of the Law on Mount Sinai.¹⁶⁹

There was no edifice constructed or rented expressly for the reunions, consequently no art, no image. Every figurative representation would have recalled Paganism, and appeared like idolatry.¹⁷⁰ The meetings took place at the houses of the best-known brethren, or who had a well-regulated room.¹⁷¹ They preferred for this purpose, rooms which in the oriental houses form the upper story,¹⁷² and correspond to our drawing-room. These rooms are high, pierced with numerous windows, very fresh, and well aired. It was there that they received their friends, held their festivities, prayed, and laid out their dead.¹⁷³ The groups thus formed constituted so many "domestic churches" or pious coteries, full of moral activity, and very similar to those "domestic colleges," examples of which are found, towards the same period, existing in Pagan society.¹⁷⁴ Without a doubt, in the large cities which possessed several of these domestic churches, there were plenary churches, in which all the partial churches were reunited.¹⁷⁵ But generally the

spirit of the time favored small societies. All important affairs were thus established in inconsiderable centres, in which each one is in close contact with the other, and in which the souls are warmed by a powerful love. Buddhism alone, up to that period, had raised man to this degree of heroism and purity. The triumph of Christianity is inexplicable when only studied up to the fourth century. What happens almost always in human affairs happened for Christianity. It succeeded when it was commencing to decline morally; it became official when it was already nothing more than a remnant of itself; its popularity began when its true period of originality and youth had passed; but it had no less deserved its high reward. It had merited it, for its three centuries of virtue, for the wonderful amount of inclination to the good which it had inspired. When we think of this miracle, no hyperbole concerning the excellence of Jesus appears out of place. It was he, he always, who was the inspirer, the Master, the vital principle in his church. His divine *rôle* increased every year, and this was right. He was no longer only a man of God, a great prophet, a man approved of and authorized by God, a man powerful in word and deed. These expressions, which sufficed for the faith and love of the disciples of the early days,¹⁷⁶ now passed for insignificant. Jesus is the Lord, the Christ, a personage entirely superhuman: not God yet, but very near being so. They live in him, they die in him, they are raised in him. Almost all they say of God they say of him. He is, indeed, already a sort of divine hypostasis; and, when they shall wish to identify him with God, it will only be a matter of vocabulary, a simple "communication of idioms," as the theologians say. We shall see that Paul himself will reach this. The most advanced formulas which we shall find in the epistle to the Colossians exist already in germ, in the older epistle. "We have but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things."¹⁷⁷ A few words more, and Jesus will be the creative *logos*.¹⁷⁸ The

most exaggerated formulas of the consubstantialists of the fourth century can already be foreseen.

The idea of Christian redemption underwent a similar transformation in the churches of Paul. They knew little about the parables, the moral teachings of Jesus. The gospels were not yet in existence. Christ, with these churches, is scarcely a real personality, once mortal. He is the image of God,¹⁷⁹ a heavenly minister, having taken upon himself the sins of the world,¹⁸⁰ and charged to reconcile the world with God. He is a divine renovator, recreating everything anew, and abolishing the past.¹⁸¹ He died for all, all are dead to the world through him, and are to live no more except through him.¹⁸² He was rich in all the riches of divinity, and he became poor for us.¹⁸³ The whole Christian life, therefore, is to be a contradiction of the human signification. Weakness is the true strength;¹⁸⁴ death is the true life; carnal wisdom is folly.¹⁸⁵ Happy is he who carries in his body the dying of Jesus, who is unceasingly exposed to death for Jesus.¹⁸⁶ He will live again with Jesus. He will contemplate his glory face to face, and be changed into him, rising unceasingly from glory to glory.¹⁸⁷ The Christian thus lives in expectation of death, and in a perpetual lamentation. In measure, as the outward man (the body) falls into ruins, the inward man (the soul) is renewed. A moment of tribulations gains for him an eternity of glory. What matter if his earthly house be dissolved? He has in heaven an eternal house, not made by hands of man. Terrestrial life is an exile; death is the return to God, an equivalent to the absorption of everything mortal by life eternal.¹⁸⁸ But this treasure of hope is carried by the Christian in an earthen vessel;¹⁸⁹ and, until the last day, when everything shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ,¹⁹⁰ must he live in trembling.

CHAPTER X.

RETURN OF PAUL TO ANTIOCH.—DISPUTE BETWEEN PETER
AND PAUL.—COUNTER-MISSION ORGANIZED BY JAMES,
BROTHER OF THE LORD.

PAUL, nevertheless, felt the need of revisiting the churches of Syria. It was three years since he had left Antioch. Although it had lasted less time than the first, this new mission had been much more important. The new churches, recruited among vigorous and energetic populations, brought to the feet of Jesus homages of priceless value. Paul wished to relate all this to the apostles, and to attach himself to the mother-church, model of the others.¹ In spite of his love of independence, he well perceived that, unless in communion with Jerusalem, there was only schism and dissension. The admirable mixture of opposite qualities which formed his nature, allowed him to join in the most unexpected manner docility to haughtiness, revolt to submission, harshness to mildness. Paul made the celebration of the passover of the year 54,² a pretext for his departure. In order to give more solemnity to his resolution, and to render a change of mind impossible, he made a vow to celebrate this passover at Jerusalem. The manner of taking these vows was to shear the head and bind one's self to certain prayers, as well as to abstinence from wine, for thirty days before the festivity.³ Paul bade adieu to his church, had his head shorn at Cenchrea,⁴ and embarked for Syria. He was accompanied by Aquila and Priscilla, who were to stop at Ephesus; perhaps also by Silas. As to Timothy, it is probable that he did not leave Corinth or the coasts of the Ægean Sea. We shall find him again at Ephesus, after the lapse of a year.⁵

The vessel stopped a few days at Ephesus. Paul had time to go to the synagogue and dispute with the Jews. They begged

him to remain, but he informed them of his vow, and declared that he wished by all means to celebrate the feast at Jerusalem. He simply promised to return. He then took leave of Aquila and Priscilla, and of those with whom he had already entered into connections, and set sail again for Cesarea of Palestine, from whence he soon went to Jerusalem.⁶

He there celebrated the feast in accordance with his vow. Perhaps this entirely Jewish scruple was a concession, like so many others made by him, to the spirit of the church of Jerusalem. He hoped by an act of great devotion to have his bold doings pardoned, and to gain for himself the good-will of the Judaizing party.⁷ The discussions had become scarcely quiet, and peace only lasted through force of transactions. It is probable that he profited by the occasion to give a considerable offering to the poor of Jerusalem.⁸ Paul, according to his custom, remained a very short while in the metropolis.⁹ He was here in the presence of susceptibilities which would not have failed to bring about misunderstandings, had he prolonged his sojourn. He, accustomed to live in the delicious atmosphere of his truly Christian churches, found here, under the name of relatives of Jesus, no one but Jews. It struck him that not sufficient grandeur was assigned to Jesus. He was indignant that after Jesus any value whatever should be set upon what had existed before him.

The chief of the church of Jerusalem was now James, the brother of the Lord. Not that the authority of Peter had diminished, but he was no longer stationed in the holy city. Partly in imitation of Paul, he had entered upon active apostolic life.¹⁰ The idea that Paul was the apostle of the Gentiles, and Peter the apostle of circumcision,¹¹ came to be more and more accepted. Conformably to this idea, Peter set about evangelizing the Jews throughout all Syria.¹² He took with him a sister, as wife and deaconess,¹³ thus giving the first example of a married apostle,—an example which Protestant missionaries were to follow at a later period. John-Mark always appears to accom-

pany him as his disciple, his companion, and his interpreter :¹⁴ a circumstance which leads us to suppose that the first of the apostles did not understand Greek. Peter had, to a certain extent, adopted John-Mark, and treated him as his son.¹⁵

The details of the wanderings of Peter are unknown to us. The account given of them later,¹⁶ is to a great extent fabulous. We only know that the life of the apostle of circumcision, like that of the apostle of the Gentiles, was a series of trials.¹⁷ We can also believe that the itinerary which serves as basis of the fabulous acts of Peter, — an itinerary which conducts the apostle from Jerusalem to Cesarea, from Cesarea along the coast by way of Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Biblos, Tripoli, Antaradus, to Laodicea on the sea, and from Laodicea to Antioch, is not imaginary. The apostle certainly visited Antioch.¹⁸ We even believe he made it his ordinary residence for a certain period.¹⁹ The lakes and the ponds formed by the Orontes and the Arkeuthas, in the suburbs of the city, and which furnished an inferior quality²⁰ of fresh-water fish to the lower classes at a low price, probably offered him an opportunity to resume his old calling of fisherman.

Several of the brothers of the Lord, and some of the members of the apostolic college likewise, traversed the neighboring countries of Judea. Like Peter, and different in that respect from the missionaries of the school of Paul, they travelled with their wives, and lived at the expense of the churches.²¹ The calling which they had followed in Galilee was not, like that of Paul of a nature to support them, and they had abandoned it long before this. The women who accompanied them, and whom they called sisters, were the origin of those *sous-introduites*, a sort of deaconesses or nuns, living under the direction of a clerk, who play an important rôle in the history of ecclesiastical celibacy.²²

Peter, having in this manner ceased to be the resident chief of the church of Jerusalem, several members of the apostolic council having likewise entered upon a life of journeying, the first rank in the mother-church was assigned to James.²³

He thus became "Bishop of the Hebrews," that is to say, of that portion of the disciples who spoke Semitic.²⁴ That did not constitute him Chief of the church Universal. No one had, strictly speaking, the right to take such a title, which was in fact shared between Peter and Paul.²⁵ But the presidency of the church of Jerusalem, joined to the fact of his being brother of the Lord, gave to James a very great authority, since the church of Jerusalem always remained the centre of unity. James was, moreover, very old.²⁶ Some manifestations of arrogance, a great deal of prejudice, a spirit of stubbornness, were the consequence of such a position. All the faults which were at a later period to make the Court of Rome a scourge to the church, and the principal agent of its corruption, already existed in embryo in this primitive community of Jerusalem.

James was a respectable man in many regards, but a narrow-minded one, against whom Jesus would have levelled his finest-pointed railleries, had he known him; at least, had he known him such as he is represented to us. Was he really the brother, or only the first cousin of Jesus?²⁷ All the testimony in this respect is so concordant, that we are forced to believe it. But then this is one of the most fantastic proceedings of nature. Probably this brother, not having been converted until after the death of Jesus, possessed to a less extent the true tradition of the Master than those who, without being his relatives, had been intimate with him during his life. At least, the very surprising fact remains, that two children of the same parents, or the same family, should have been at first enemies, should then have become reconciled to remain so entirely distinct,—that the only well-known brother of Jesus should have been a sort of Pharisee, an outward ascetic, a devotee, infected with all the ridiculous practices which Jesus relentlessly pursued. But certain it is, that the personage whom they called at this period "James, the Brother of the Lord," or "James, the Just," or the "Bulwark of the People,"²⁸ was, in the church of Jerusalem, the representative of the most intolerant Jewish party. While

the active apostles were travelling about the world to conquer it in Jesus' name, the brother of Jesus, at Jerusalem, was doing all that he could to destroy their work, and contradict Jesus after his death in a more profound manner, perhaps, than he had done during his life.

This society of ill-converted Pharisees, this world, in reality more Jewish than Christian, living about the temple, preserving the ancient practices of Jewish piety as if Jesus had not declared them vain, constituted an insupportable union for Paul. What must have irritated him in particular was the opposition of all these people to propaganda. Like the Jews of strict observance,²⁹ the partisans of James were opposed to proselytism. Old religious organizations frequently fall into such contradictions. On one side, they proclaim themselves in sole possession of the truth; on the other, they do not wish to enlarge their sphere,—they aspire to keep the truth to themselves. French Protestantism presents in our day a similar phenomenon. Two opposite parties, one desiring above all the preservation of old symbols, the other capable of gaining a multitude of new adherents to Protestantism, having risen in the bosom of the Reformed Church, the conservative party has waged a furious warfare against it. It has offensively rejected everything which would have resembled a surrender of family traditions; and, in place of brilliant destinies, it has preferred to be allowed the pleasure of remaining a petty *cœnaculum* of no importance, closed, and composed of thinking people; that is to say, of people sharing the same prejudices, and of one mind in regard to things deemed aristocratic. The feeling of distrust experienced by the members of the old party at Jerusalem, before the bold missionary who brought them multitudes of new brethren without titles of Jewish nobility, must have presented similar circumstances. They saw themselves overwhelmed, and, instead of falling at the feet of Paul and thanking him, they regarded him as a disturber, an intruder, who was forcing the gates with people recruited from all quarters. More than one

hard word was, it appears, exchanged.³⁰ It is probable that it was at this moment that James, brother of the Lord, conceived the project which came near destroying the work of Jesus. I refer to the project of a counter-mission, charged to follow the apostle of the Gentiles, to contradict his principles, to persuade the converts that it was obligatory for them to have themselves circumcised, and to practise the entire law.³¹ Sectarian movements never take place without schisms of this kind, as was the case with the chiefs of St. Simonism who denied each other, and still remained united in St. Simon, while those surviving them were eventually reconciled of their own accord.³²

Paul avoided the outbursts by setting out as soon as possible for Antioch. It was probably at this time that Silas separated from him. The latter was originally of the church of Jerusalem. He remained there, and henceforth attached himself to Peter.³³ Silas, as the editor of the Acts, appears to have been a man of conciliating disposition,³⁴ vacillating between the two parties, and attached alternately to the two leaders, — a true Christian in the main, and of that opinion, which, by its triumph, saved the church. Never, in fact, did the Christian church contain in its organization so profound a cause of schism as that which disturbed it at this period. Luther, and the most methodical scholiast, differed less than Paul and James. Thanks to a few mild and good characters, — Silas, Luke, and Timothy, — all the shocks were deadened, all the bitterness disguised. A beautiful narration, calm and dignified,³⁵ only displays a fraternal agreement in these years, which were fermented by such terrible disorders.

At Antioch, Paul breathed freely. He met there his old companion Barnabas,³⁶ and they doubtless experienced great joy upon meeting again; for the motive which had for the moment alienated them was not a question of principle. Here, probably, Paul again met his disciple Titus, who had not accompanied him on his second journey, and who, henceforth, was to attach himself to him.³⁷ The narration of the miracles of

conversion performed by Paul, surprised this young and active church. Paul, on his part, experienced a lively sentiment of joy upon re-visiting the city which had been the cradle of his apostolate, — the place where he had conceived, ten years before, in company with Barnabas, his immense projects, — the church which had conferred upon him the title of missionary of the Gentiles. A very grave incident was destined soon to interrupt these sweet effusions, and to call to life the temporarily suppressed divisions, with a degree of intensity which they had not as yet possessed.

While Paul was at Antioch, Peter arrived there.³³ At first, this only served to redouble the joy and cordiality. The apostle of the Jews and the apostle of the Gentiles loved each other, as very good and strong natures always love each other when they find themselves in connection with one another. Peter communicated unreservedly with the converted heathen, even openly violating the Jewish ordinances. He did not scruple to eat with them; but this good understanding was soon disturbed. James had executed his fatal project. Brethren, furnished with letters of recommendation, signed by him,³⁹ as the chief of the Twelve, and who alone had the right to authorize a mission, set out from Jerusalem. They pretended that no one could announce himself as a teacher of Christ, if he had not been at Jerusalem to compare his doctrine with that of James, brother of the Lord,⁴⁰ and if he did not bear a certificate from the latter. Jerusalem was, according to them, the source of all faith, of every apostolic mandate; the true apostles resided there.⁴¹ Whoever preached without letters of credentials from the head of the mother-church, without having sworn obedience to him, should be rejected as a false prophet, and a false apostle, — as an envoy of Satan.⁴² Paul, who had no such letters, was an intruder, priding himself on unreal revelations, and upon a mission to which he could not produce the titles.⁴³ He urged the fact of his visions, even sustaining his having seen Jesus in a supernatural manner. “What could be more chimerical?”

said the Hierosolymites. "No vision equals the evidence of the senses; visions do not afford certainty; the spectre seen may be an evil spirit; the idolaters have visions exactly like the devout. When we interrogate the apparition, we can reply to ourselves as we choose; the spectre shines for a moment, then disappears quickly; there is no time to speak calmly to him. The thoughts of the dreamer are not his own; in this state there is no presence of mind. See the Son disembodied! but that is impossible; it would bring death with it. The superhuman brilliancy of such a vision would be fatal. Even an angel, in order to render himself visible, is obliged to assume a mortal form."

The emissaries, in this connection, referred to a number of visions had by the unfaithful and the impious, and so arrived to the conclusion that the column-apostles, those who had seen Jesus, possessed a very great superiority. They even quoted Scripture texts,⁴⁴ proving that visions came from God in his wrath, while the intercourse face to face was a privilege of friends. "How can Paul sustain that through an interview of an hour Jesus had rendered him capable of teaching? An entire year of teaching had been necessary to Jesus in order to form his apostles. And if Jesus really did appear to him, how is it that he teaches the contrary of Jesus' doctrine? Let him prove the reality of the conversation that he had with Jesus, by conforming to the precepts of Jesus, by loving his apostles, by not declaring war against those whom Jesus has chosen. If he wishes to serve the truth, let him become the disciple of Jesus' disciples, and then he will be enabled to be an useful assistant."⁴⁵ The question of ecclesiastical authority and individual revelation, of Catholicism and Protestantism, was thus put with veritable grandeur. Jesus had decided upon nothing very concisely in this respect. While he lived, and in the first years subsequent to his death, Jesus was so entirely the life and soul of his little church that no idea of government and constitution presented itself. Now, on the contrary, the question was to know whether there was a power representing Jesus, or whether the Christian

conscience remained free; whether, in order to preach Jesus, letters of obedience were necessary, or whether the affirmation that one was enlightened by Jesus was sufficient. As Paul did not give any proof of his immediate mission other than his affirmation, his situation in many respects was weak. We shall see by what prodigies of eloquence and activity the great innovator, attacked on all sides, will confront every attack, and maintain his right without absolute rupture with the Apostolic College, whose authority he recognized whenever his liberty was not restrained by it. But this struggle itself will render him but slightly agreeable to us. A man who disputes, resists, speaks of himself, — a man who maintains his opinion and his prerogative, who puts others ill at ease, who apostrophizes them to their face, — such a man is disagreeable to us. Jesus, in such a case, yielded everything, and freed himself from embarrassment by some pleasing expression.

The emissaries of James arrived at Antioch.⁴⁶ James, while allowing that the converted Gentiles could be saved without observing the law of Moses, did not admit that a true Jew, a circumcised Jew, could violate the law with impunity. The horror of the disciples of James reached its height when they saw the chief of the churches of circumcision act like a true Pagan, and tear these outward compacts which a respectable Jew regarded as his titles of nobility. They spoke emphatically to Peter, who was much frightened. This man, profoundly kind and upright, desired peace above all things. He was incapable of opposing any one. This rendered him changeable, at least in appearance. He was easily confused, and could not reply readily: even during the life of Jesus, this kind of timidity, resulting from awkwardness rather than from lack of heart, had led him to commit a fault which cost him many tears.⁴⁷ Little able to dispute, incapable of opposing persistent people, in difficult cases he kept silent and delayed action. Such a style of character led him again upon this occasion to commit a great

act of weakness. Placed between two classes of people, of which he could not satisfy the one without offending the other, he isolated himself completely, and lived apart, refusing all connection with the uncircumcised. This manner of acting greatly wounded the converted Gentiles. What was still graver than this, is, that all the circumcised imitated him. Barnabas himself allowed himself to be won over, and avoided the uncircumcised Christians.

The anger of Paul knew no bounds. But call to mind the ritual capacity of the repast in common. To refuse to eat with a portion of the community was to excommunicate it. Paul burst out into reproaches,⁴³ treated this conduct as hypocrisy, accused Peter and his imitators of distorting the signification of the Gospel. The church was to assemble shortly after the two apostles met there. Face to face, and before the whole assembly, Paul violently apostrophized Peter, and blamed his inconsistency. "What!" said he to him, "thou who art a Jew, thou dost not live as a Jew;⁴⁹ in practice thou comportest thyself like a true heathen, and thou wishest to force us to become Jews." Then he developed his favorite theory of salvation wrought by Jesus and not by the law, of the abrogation of the law by Jesus. It is probable that Peter did not reply to him. In the main, he was of Paul's opinion. Like all men who seek through harmless contrivances to get clear of a difficulty, he did not pretend to be right,—he only wished to satisfy some, and not alienate the others. In this manner, one usually succeeds only in offending every one.

The withdrawal of the envoys of James alone put an end to the dissension. After their departure, the good Peter doubtless recommenced eating with the Gentiles as formerly. These singular successions of violence and fraternity constitute one of the traits of Jewish character. Modern critics, who conclude from certain passages of the Epistle to the Galatians,⁵⁰ that the rupture between Peter and Paul was absolute, put themselves in contradiction, not only to the Acts but to other

passages of the epistle to the Galatians.⁵¹ Fervent men pass their lives disputing together without ever falling out. We must not judge these characters after the manner of things which take place in our day between people well-bred, and susceptible in a point of honor. This last word, especially, never has had much significance with the Jews.

It is very apparent, nevertheless, that the rupture of Antioch left profound traces. The great church on the borders of the Orontes was divided, if I may be allowed to express myself so, into two parishes,—that of the circumcised on one hand, that of the uncircumcised on the other. The separation of these two halves of the church lasted for a long while. Antioch, as is stated at a later period, had two bishops,—one instituted by Peter, the other by Paul. Euodias and Ignatius are designated as having, after the apostles, become these dignitaries.⁵²

As to the animosity of the emissaries of James, it did nothing but increase. The scene at Antioch impressed them with a resentment, the indignant mention of which is still found, after a century, in the writings of the Jewish-Christian party.⁵³ This eloquent adversary, who alone by himself had stopped the church of Antioch on the very point of acknowledging their views, became their great enemy. They vowed him a hatred, which, during his lifetime, will cause him countless misfortunes; which, after his death, will call down upon him the bloody anathemas and atrocious calumnies of an entire half of the church.⁵⁴ Passion and religious enthusiasm are far from suppressing human weaknesses. In leaving Antioch, the agents of the Hierosolymitic party swore to overturn the establishments of Paul, to destroy his churches, to throw down what he had built up with so much labor.⁵⁵ It appears that upon this occasion, new letters were sent from Jerusalem in the name of the apostles. It is even possible that one of these hateful letters has been preserved to us, in the epistle of Jude,—brother of James, and like him, brother of the Lord,—which constitutes a part of the canon. It is one of the most violent *facta* against

anonymous adversaries, who are represented as disobedient and ungodly persons.⁵⁶ The style of the writing, which much more resembles the classic Greek than that of the greater portion of the New Testament, bears much analogy to the style of the epistle of James. James and Jude probably did not understand Greek. The church of Jerusalem perhaps had Hellenic secretaries for such communications.

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation,⁵⁷ it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God unto lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not. And the angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation,⁵⁸ he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise also, these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.⁵⁹ Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses,⁶⁰ durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, ‘the Lord rebuke thee.’⁶¹ But these speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and greedily after the error of Balaam⁶² for reward,⁶³ and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are the spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear. Clouds

are they without water, carried about of winds; trees, whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.⁶⁴ These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouths speak great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage. But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time who should walk after their own ungodly lusts."

From this moment, Paul becomes, in the eyes of an entire fragment of the church, a most dangerous heretic, a false Jew,⁶⁵ a false apostle,⁶⁶ a false prophet,⁶⁷ a second Balaam,⁶⁸ a Jezebel,⁶⁹ a wretch who was harping upon the destruction of the Temple.⁷⁰ To tell all in two words, a Simon the Magician.⁷¹ Peter was reputed to be everywhere and always occupied in opposing him.⁷² They accustomed themselves to designate the apostle of the Gentiles by the sobriquet of Nicholas (Conqueror of the people), approximative translation of *Balaam*.⁷³ The sobriquet took well. A heathen seducer who had visions, although unfaithful,⁷⁴ a man who prevailed upon the people to sin with heathen maidens,⁷⁵ appeared the true type of Paul,—this false visionary, this partisan of mixed marriages.⁷⁶ In the same manner his disciples were called *Nicolaitanes*.⁷⁷ Far from forgetting his rôle as persecutor, they dwelt upon it in the most odious manner.⁷⁸ His gospel was a false gospel.⁷⁹ It is to Paul that reference is made when the fanatics of the party conversed among themselves in ambiguous language of a per-

sonage whom they called "the Apostate,"⁸⁰ or "the Hostile Man,"⁸¹ or "the Impostor," precursor of the Anti-Christ, upon whose trail the chief of the apostles follows in order to repair the evil which he does.⁸² Paul was the "frivolous man" from whom the Gentiles, in their ignorance, received the doctrine inimical to the law.⁸³ His visions, which he called "the deep things of God," they termed "the deep things of Satan."⁸⁴ His churches they called "the synagogues of Satan."⁸⁵ Through hatred to Paul, it was loudly proclaimed that the twelve alone constituted the foundation of the edifice of Christ.⁸⁶

An entire legend began from that moment to form itself against Paul. They refused to believe that a genuine Jew could have been able to commit an atrocity like the one of which they found him guilty. They claimed that he had been born a heathen,⁸⁷ that he had become a proselyte. And why? Calumny is never in want of reasons. Paul had had himself circumcised because he had hoped to marry the daughter of the high priest.⁸⁸ The high priest, like a wise man as he was, having refused her to him, Paul, out of spite, set about declaiming against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the law.⁸⁹ . . . Such is the reward that one obtains from fanatics for having served their cause otherwise than they desired; or rather, for having saved the cause which they were destroying by their narrow minds and their foolish exclusions.

James, on the contrary, became for the Jewish-Christian party the chief of all Christendom, the bishop of bishops, the president of all the good churches, of those which God had really established.⁹⁰ It was probably after his death that they created for him this apocryphal rôle;⁹¹ but without doubt the legend in this case is founded in several respects upon the real character of the hero. The grave language of James, so lacking in emphasis;⁹² his manners, which reminded them of a sage of the old world, a solemn Brahmin, or an ancient mobed; his sanctity of show and ostentation;—made him a character for exhibition to the people, an official holy man, and even then a sort of pope.

The Jewish-Christians became accustomed by degrees to believe that he had been clothed with the Jewish priesthood,⁹³ and as the insignia of the high priest was the *petalon*, or blade of gold⁹⁴ on the forehead, they decorated him with it.⁹⁵ "Bulwark of the people," with his blade of gold, thus became a sort of Jewish bonze, a high priest in imitation of the customs of the Jewish-Christians. It was supposed, that, like the high priest, by virtue of a special permission, he entered once a year into the sanctuary.⁹⁶ They even pretended that he belonged to the sacerdotal race.⁹⁷ They sustained that he had been ordained by Jesus, bishop of the holy city, — that Jesus had entrusted to him his own episcopal throne.⁹⁸ The Jewish-Christians made a large portion of the people of Jerusalem believe that it was the merits of this servant of God which averted the thunderbolt ready to burst upon the people.⁹⁹ They went so far as to create for him, as for Jesus, a legend founded upon passages from the Scriptures, in which it was pretended that the prophets had spoken of him figuratively.¹⁰⁰

The image of Jesus, in this Christian family, was diminishing every day, while in the churches of Paul it assumed more and more colossal proportions. The Christians of James were simply pious Jews (*hasidim*), believing in the Jewish mission of Christ: the Christians of Paul were Christians in the sense which has since prevailed. Law, temple, sacrifices, high priest, blade of gold, — all has become indifferent to them. Jesus has replaced all, abolished all. To attach a sacred value to whatever it may be, is to do violence to the merits of Jesus. It was natural for Paul, who had not seen Jesus, that the entirely human figure of the Galilean master should transform itself into a metaphysical type, much more easily than for Peter, and the others who had conversed with Jesus. Jesus, in Paul's mind, is not a man who has lived and taught: he is the Christ who died for our sins, who saves us, who justifies¹⁰¹ us. He is an entirely divine being; we partake of him;¹⁰² we communicate with him in a wonderful manner.¹⁰³ He is the redemption,

the justification, the wisdom, the righteousness¹⁰⁴ of man. He is the King of Glory.¹⁰⁵ All power in heaven and on the earth is soon to be delivered up to him.¹⁰⁶ He is only inferior to God the Father.¹⁰⁷ Had this school alone transmitted us writings, we would not come into contact with the person of Jesus, and we might doubt that he ever existed. But those who knew him, and who kept the recollection of him, wrote, perhaps, already towards this period, the first notes upon which were composed those divine writings (I refer to the Gospels) which made the fortune of Christianity, and transmitted to us the essential traits of the most important character that there ever was to learn.

CHAPTER XI.

TROUBLE IN THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

THE emissaries of James, having left Antioch, directed their course towards the churches of Galatia.¹ The Hierosolymites knew of the existence of these churches a long time prior to this. It was even through them that arose the first difficulty with circumcision, and that the so-called council of Jerusalem took place. James had probably recommended to his confidants to attack this important point, one of the centres of Paul's power.

It was easy for them to succeed. These Galatians were people easy to deceive. The last who went to speak to them in the name of Jesus was almost sure of being right. The Hierosolymites had soon persuaded a large number of them that they were not good Christians. They repeated to them unceasingly that they should have themselves circumcised, and observe the entire law. With the childish vanity of fanatical Jews, the deputies represented circumcision as a corporeal advantage. They were proud of it, and claimed that one could not be a respectable man without this privilege.

The custom of ridiculing the heathen, of picturing them as inferior and badly bred people, gave rise to these fantastic ideas.² The Hierosolymites circulated, at the same time, a large number of invectives and calumnies against Paul. They accused him of assuming the attitude of an independent apostle, while he had received his mission from Jerusalem, where they had seen him at different times, as a disciple in the school of the twelve. To go to Jerusalem, — was not that to recognize the superiority of the apostolic college? What he knew, he had learned from the apostles. He had accepted the rules which they had established. This missionary, who pretended to excuse them from circumcision, knew very well how to preach and to

practise it, in time of need. Turning against him his own concessions, they quoted cases in which he had been seen to recognize the necessity of Jewish practices.³ Probably they related, in particular, the facts in connection with the circumcision of Titus and Timothy. How did he, who had not seen Jesus, dare to speak in the name of Jesus? It was Peter and James who should be considered as the two apostles, — as the depositaries of revelation.

The consciences of the good Galatians were much troubled. Some of them abandoned the doctrine of Paul, went over to new teachers, and had themselves circumcised; others remained faithful to their first master. The trouble, at any rate, was very great. They said the severest things to each other.⁴ This news, upon reaching Paul, filled him with indignation.

The jealousy which constituted the basis of his character, his susceptibility, already often put to the test, were excited to the highest degree. It was the third time that the Pharisean party of Jerusalem had undertaken to demolish his work in measure, as he built it up. The sort of cowardice that there was in attacking weak, docile, and defenceless persons, and those who only live upon the confidence of their master, was revolting to him; he could stand it no longer. Upon the spur of the moment, the bold and vehement apostle dictated this admirable epistle, which may be compared, with the exception of the art of writing, to the most beautiful classic works, and in which his impetuous nature is painted in letters of fire. The title of "apostle," which he had but timidly assumed up to this moment, he now takes as a sort of challenge, in order to reply to the denials of his adversaries, and to maintain what he believes to be the truth.

"Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead);

"And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia :

"Grace be to you, and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ,

“Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father :

“To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel :

“Which is not another ; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

“But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

“As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

“For do I now persuade men, or God ? or do I seek to please men ? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

“But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

“For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

“For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it :

“And profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.

“But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace,

“To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen ; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood :⁵

“Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me ; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.

“Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.

“But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.

“Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God I lie not.

“Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia ;

“And was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ :

“But they had heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed.

“And they glorified God in me.

“Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with barnabas, and took Titus with me also.

“And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.

“But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised :

“And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage :

“To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour ; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.

“But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me : God accepteth no man's person : for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me :

“But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter ;

“(For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles ;)

“And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.

“Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.

“But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

“For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.

“And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

“But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

“We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,

“Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

“But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

“For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.

“For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.

“I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

“I do not frustrate the grace of God : for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

“O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?

“This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

“Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?

“Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain.

“He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

“Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.⁶

“Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. . . .

“But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

“Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

“But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

“For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.⁷

“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female : for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

“And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.

“Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all ;

“But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father.

“Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world :

“But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,

“To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

“And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

“Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son ; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

“Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.

“But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage ?

“Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

“I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.

“Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am ; for I am as ye are : ye have not injured me at all.

“Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.

“And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected ; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.

“Where is then the blessedness ye spake of ? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.

“Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth ?

“They zealously affect you, but not well ; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.

“But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing and not only when I am present with you.

“My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you,

“I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice ; for I stand in doubt of you. . . .

“Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

“Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.

“For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

“Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law ; ye are fallen from grace.

“For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

“For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision ; but faith which worketh by love.

“Ye did run well ; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth ?

“This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you.

“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.⁸

“I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded : but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

“And I brethren, if I yet preach circumcision,⁹ why do I yet suffer persecution ? then is the offence of the cross ceased.

“I would they were even cut off which trouble you.¹⁰

“For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty ; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.

“For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this ; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

“But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

“This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.

“For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh : and these are contrary the one to the other ; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

“But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,

“Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

“Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like : of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

“But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace ; longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,

“Meekness, temperance : against such there is no law.

“And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.”

Paul dictated this entire epistle with one stroke, as if filled with inward fire. According to his custom, he wrote with his own hand, as postscript, —

“Note well these characters :¹¹ they are from my hand.”

It appears natural that he should conclude with the customary salutation, but he was too much aroused. His constant idea beset him. The subject exhausted, he returns to it again, with several energetic touches :—

“As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh,¹² they constrain you to be circumcised ; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law ; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.¹³ But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor

uncircumcision, but a new creature.¹⁴ And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.¹⁵ From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.¹⁶ Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen."

Paul dispatched the letter immediately. If he had taken an hour to reflect, we may doubt whether he would have allowed it to go. We are in ignorance as to whom it was entrusted. Paul, doubtless, had it carried by one of his disciples, whom he commissioned with a tour in Galatia. The epistle, in fact, is not addressed to any particular community.¹⁷ None of the little churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, or Antioch of Pisidia was large enough to serve as metropolis to the others. The apostle, on the other hand, does not give to the intended recipients any instruction as to the manner of circulating this letter.¹⁸ We are also ignorant of the effect which the letter produced upon the Galatians. Doubtless it strengthened the party of Paul.¹⁹ It is probable, however, that it did not entirely destroy the opposite party. Henceforth almost all the churches will be divided into two camps. Until the destruction of Jerusalem (year 70), the church of Judea will maintain her pretensions. It is not until the end of the first century that a real reconciliation will take place, a little at the expense of Paul's glory, which for nearly two hundred years will be wrapped in shadows, but with the full triumph of his fundamental ideas. From that moment the Jewish-Christians will be no more than an old and obstinate sect, expiring slowly and obscurely, and not meeting with its end until towards the fifth century,²⁰ in the abandoned cantons of Syria. Paul, in return, will be almost disowned. His title of apostle, denied by his enemies,²¹ will be feebly defended by his friends.²² The churches which are notoriously indebted to him for their establishment, will claim to have been founded by him and by Peter. The church of Corinth, for instance, will do the most flagrant violence to history, in order to show that she owed her origin to Peter, and to Paul, at the same time.²³ The con-

version of the Gentiles will pass for the collective work of the twelve.²⁴ Papias, Polycrates, Justin, and Hegesippus will appear to designedly suppress the *rôle* of Paul, and almost ignore his existence. It is only when the idea of a canon of new sacred writings shall have been established that Paul will re-assume his importance. His letters then will, to some extent, leave the archives of the churches, in order to become a basis of Christian theology, which they will renew from century to century.

At the distance at which we are, Paul's victory appears to us to have been complete. Paul relates to us, and perhaps exaggerates, the wrongs done him. Who will tell us of the wrongs done by Paul? Is not the base idea which he attributes to his adversaries of following him up, in order to take away the affection of his disciples from him, and then to boast of the circumcision of these simple people as of a triumph,²⁵ a burlesque? Is not the recital of his connections with the church of Jerusalem, so different from that of the Acts, somewhat arranged for the purposes of the moment?²⁶ Is not the pretension of having been an apostle by divine right, from the very day of his conversion,²⁷ historically inexact, inasmuch as the conviction of his own apostolate was formed in him slowly, and did not arrive at completion until after his first great mission? Was Peter really as reprehensible as he says? Was not the conduct of the Galilean apostle, on the contrary, that of a conciliating man, preferring brotherhood to principles, wishing to satisfy every one, changing in order to avoid outbursts, blamed by all simply because he alone was right? We have no means of replying to these questions. Paul was very personal. We are allowed to imagine that, upon more than one occasion, he attributed to a private revelation, facts which he had learned from his elders.²⁷

The epistle to the Galatians is so extraordinary a writing, the apostle paints himself in it with so much *naïveté* and sincerity, that it would be highly unjust to turn against him a document which does so much honor to his talent and eloquence. The anxieties of a contracted orthodoxy do not belong to us. Let

others explain how one can be a saint, and at the same time heap abuse upon old Cephas.

We do not lower Paul beneath the grade of great men, when we show that he was at times hasty, passionate, pre-occupied with defending himself and combating his enemies. In every respect, the veritable ancestor of Protestantism, Paul, has the faults of a Protestant. There are many experiences and time needed, in order to make one see that no dogma is worth the while to resist to one's face, and to wrong charity. Paul is not Jesus. How far removed are we from thee, dear Master ! Where is thy mildness, thy poetry ? Thou, to whom a flower did bring pleasure and ecstasy, dost thou recognize as thy disciples these wranglers, these men, furious over their prerogatives, and desiring that everything should be held of them ? They are men : thou wast a God. Where would we be, wert thou only known to us through the harsh letters of him calling himself thy apostle ? Happily, the remembrances of Galilee still live in a few faithful memories. Perchance, already, has the Sermon on the Mount been traced upon some unseen page. That unknown disciple who holds this treasure, with him truly rests the future.

CHAPTER XII.

THIRD JOURNEY OF PAUL. — ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH
OF EPHESUS.

LESS great, less possessed of the sacred demon which had invaded his very being, Paul would have become worn out in these sterile disputations. In order to correspond to the petty minds, he would have been obliged to belittle himself. These miserable disputes would have absorbed him. Superior in genius, Paul scorned them. He pursued a direct course, and left time to decide between him and his enemies. The first rule for the man devoted to great undertakings is, to refuse to allow mediocre men to turn him from his course. Without disputing with the delegates from James, as to whether he had done right or wrong in preaching to the Gentiles and converting them, Paul only thought of beginning again, at the risk of incurring new anathemas. After having passed several months at Antioch,¹ he set out on a third mission. He was desirous of visiting his dear churches of Galatia. At times, he entered upon the subject of these churches in great perplexity. He regretted having grieved them by his severe language. He wished to change his style, and overcome the harshness of his letter² by the mildness of his speech. Paul desired, above all, to sojourn at Ephesus, where he had only halted the first time, in order to erect there a centre of preaching, as at Thessalonica and at Corinth. The field of this third mission was thus almost like that of the second. Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, were the provinces which Paul had, to a certain degree, awarded to himself.

He set out from Antioch, probably accompanied by Titus.³ At first he followed the same route as upon his second journey, and visited, for the third time,⁴ the churches of Central Asia

Minor,⁵ Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia. He soon regained his ascendancy, and was not long in effacing the remnants of the evil impressions which his enemies had striven to produce against him. At Derbe, he took a new disciple, named Gaius, who followed him.⁶ These good Galatians were very docile, but weak. Paul, accustomed to express himself in a firm tone, treated them with a firmness which, at times, he himself feared would be taken for harshness.⁷ He hesitated. He was fearful lest he had spoken to his children in a manner which probably did not sufficiently express the warm affection which he had for them in his heart.

The motives which had prevented him, upon his second journey, from evangelizing proconsular Asia no longer existing, Paul, after having concluded his tour of Galatia, set out for Ephesus. It was toward the middle of summer.⁸ From Antioch of Pisidia, the most natural route to go to Ephesus would take him to Apamea Kibotos,⁹ and from there into the basin of the Lycus, to the three cities in the neighborhood of each other, Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. These three cities, in a few years, will constitute an active centre of Christian labor, and Paul will be in uninterrupted connection with them. But, for the moment, he did not stop there, and made the acquaintance of nobody.¹⁰ Skirting the woods of Cadmus, he entered the valley of the Meander, towards the inns of Carura, a great cross-road of the highways of Asia.¹¹ From there a fine and easy road took him, in three days, by way of Nysa, Tralles, and Magnesia,¹² to the summits of the chain which separates the waters of the Meander from those of the Cayster. A narrow ravine, for the possession of which the ancient road and the torrent were disputing, caused him to descend into the "field of Asia," sung by the Homeridæ;¹³ that is to say, into the plain in which the Cayster forms a lagoon before entering the sea. It is a beautiful Greek aspect, with clear horizons, sometimes formed of five or six mountain terraces, or terminated by truncated summits. The swans and the beautiful birds, which col-

lected there, as in our day, were the admiration of all antiquity.¹⁴ There, partly in the marshes, partly attached to the slopes of Mount Corassus, resting elsewhere upon Mount Prion, with its suburbs upon another isolated hill,¹⁵ arose the great city, destined to be, after Jerusalem and Antioch, the third capital of Christianity.

We have already had occasion several times to remark, that Christianity met with her strongest claims to existence in these socal cities, if the expression may be allowed, which the Roman Empire had multiplied, — cities placed outside of nationalities, foreign to the love of country, in which all races and all religions joined hands. Ephesus was, with Alexandria, Antioch, and Corinth, the type of cities of this kind. We can form an idea of them from what the great Levantine cities are in our day. What strikes the traveller, when he traverses these labyrinths of infected bazaars, of narrow and dirty yards, of temporary constructions, caring little to last, is the complete lack of nobility, of political and even municipal spirit. In these swarms of humanity, baseness and good instincts, slothfulness and activity, impertinence and agreeableness, are met with; everything is found here excepting what constitutes an old aristocratic locality. I refer to glorious recollections indulged in in common. In addition to this, there is a great deal of gossiping, loquacity, and levity, almost every one knowing each other, and unceasingly occupying himself with the others; something trifling, impassioned, and uncertain; a vain curiosity of frivolous people, greedy to feed upon the slightest novelty, following the fashion, with great facility, but never capable of setting it. Christianity was the fruit of a sort of fermentation, which is accustomed to take place in the East in these localities, where man, free from the prejudices of birth and race, more readily adopts the views of that philosophy termed cosmopolitan or humanitarian, than the peasant, the *bourgeoise*, the noble, or feudal citizen can do. Like the socialism of our day, like all new ideas, Christianity took its start in what is called the cor-

ruption of large cities. This corruption, in fact, is frequently only a fuller and freer life, a greater awakening of the secret forces of humanity.

In former times, as now, the Jews occupied a distinct position in such mixed cities. This position was, with a very slight difference, what it still is at Smyrna and Salonica. Ephesus, in particular, possessed a very numerous Jewry.¹⁶ The heathen population was rather fanatical, as is the case in all cities which are centres of pilgrimage and famous religions. The worship of Diana of Ephesus, spread throughout the whole world, supported a number of considerable industries. Nevertheless, the importance of the city as capital of Asia, the commercial activity, the affluence of the men of every race, made Ephesus a point, in the main, very favorable for the diffusion of Christian ideas. These ideas met nowhere with a better reception than in the populous and commercial cities, — those filled with foreigners, and overrun by Syrians, Jews, and that population of uncertain origin, which, since antiquity, has been mistress of all the points of arrival on the Mediterranean.¹⁷

For centuries, Ephesus had not been a purely Hellenic city. Formerly Ephesus had shone in the first rank among Grecian cities, at least in respect to the arts ; but at different periods she had allowed the customs of Asia to seduce her. This city had always borne a bad reputation among the Greeks.¹⁸ The corruption, and the introduction of luxury were, according to the Greeks, a result of the effeminate customs of Ionia ; now they considered Ephesus the centre and the abridgment of Ionia.¹⁹ The rule of the Lydians and that of the Persians had here destroyed energy and patriotism. With Sardis, Ephesus was the most advanced point of Asiatic influence towards Europe.²⁰ The very great importance assumed here by the worship of Diana extinguished the scientific spirit, and encouraged the breaking out of all superstitions. It was almost a theocratic city.²¹ The festivities were numerous and grand.²² The privilege of asylum afforded by the temple peopled the city with malefactors.²³

Shameful sacerdotal institutions were maintained there, and must have appeared every day more devoid of sense.²⁴ This brilliant country of Heraclitus, of Parrhasius, perhaps Apelles, was no longer anything more than a city of porticos, race-courses, gymnasia, theatres, — a city of vulgar sumptuosity, in spite of the masterpieces of painting and sculpture which it still possessed.

Although the port had been spoiled by the unskillfulness of the engineers of Attalus Philadelphus, the city grew rapidly, and became the principal emporium of the region on this side the Taurus.²⁵ It was the point of landing for what arrived from Italy and from Greece, — a sort of inn or warehouse upon the sill of Asia.²⁶ Populations from every quarter were here heaped up, and made a universal city of it, in which socialistic ideas gained the ground lost by the sentiments of fatherland: The country was extremely rich, and the commerce very great; but nowhere did minds manifest such abjectness. The inscriptions betray the most shameful servility,²⁷ the most eager submission to the Romans.²⁸

It might have been called the universal rendezvous of courtesans and *viveurs*. The city was full to repletion of magicians, diviners,²⁹ mimics and flute-players,³⁰ eunuchs,³¹ jewellers,³² amulet and metal merchants,³³ and romance-writers. The expression "Ephesian novels" indicated, like that of "Milesian fables," a style of literature, — Ephesus being one of the cities in which they preferred to locate the scenes of love-stories.³⁴ The mildness of the climate, in fact, disinclined one to serious things. Dancing and singing remained the sole occupation. Public life degenerated into Bacchanalian revels.³⁵ Good studies were thrown aside.³⁶ The most extravagant miracles of Apollonius are reputed to have taken place at Ephesus.³⁷ The most celebrated Ephesian of the period now under consideration³⁸ was an astrologer named Babillus, who enjoyed the confidence of Nero and Vespasian, and who appears to have been a villain.³⁹ A beautiful Corinthian temple, the ruins of which are still visible

to-day,⁴⁰ was erected towards the same period. It was probably a temple dedicated to poor Claudius, whom Nero and Agrippina had just "pulled up to heaven with a hook," as Gallio well expresses it.

Ephesus had already been reached by Christianity when Paul went to sojourn there. We have seen that Aquila and Priscilla remained there after having left Corinth. This pious couple, to whom, by a singular fate, it was reserved to figure in the origin of the churches of Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus, formed a nucleus of disciples. Of this number, without doubt, was that Epinetes, whom St. Paul calls "the first fruits of Asia unto Christ," and whom he loved well.⁴¹ Another much more important conversion was that of a Jew named Apollonius, or Apollos, born in Alexandria, who must have landed at Ephesus shortly after the first visit of Paul.⁴² He had acquired a profound knowledge of the Greek version of the Scriptures in the Jewish schools of Egypt, an ingenious manner of interpreting them, and great eloquence. He was a sort of Philo, in search of the new ideas which were then coming to light on all sides in Judaism. During his travels, he had been in connection with the disciples of John the Baptist, and had received baptism from them. He had also heard Jesus spoken of, and it appears that from that time he accorded to the latter the title of Christ; but his notions of Christianity were incomplete. Upon his arrival at Ephesus, he went to the synagogue, where he met with much success by means of his animated and inspired language. Aquila and Priscilla heard him, and were delighted to receive such an assistant. They took him aside, completed his doctrine, and gave him more precise ideas upon certain points. As they were not very skillful theologians themselves, they did not think, it appears, of having him re-baptized in the name of Jesus. Apollos formed a little group around him, to which he taught his doctrine, rectified by Aquila and Priscilla; but upon which he only performed the baptism of John, the only one which he knew. At the end of some time, he wished to go to Achaia, and the

brethren of Ephesus gave him a very warm letter of recommendation to those in Corinth.

It was under these circumstances that Paul arrived at Ephesus. He lodged with Aquila and Priscilla, as he had done at Corinth,⁴³ associated himself again with them, and worked in their shop. Ephesus was justly celebrated for its tents.⁴⁴ Artisans of this kind probably inhabited the poor suburbs which extended from Mount Prion to the steep hill of *Aia-Solouk*.⁴⁵ That was doubtless the first Christian home. There were the apostolic basilicas, the tombs venerated by all Christendom.⁴⁶ After the destruction of the temple of Diana, Ephesus having exchanged its Pagan celebrity for an equal Christian celebrity, and having become a city of the first order in the recollections and legends of a new faith, Byzantine Ephesus⁴⁷ grouped itself entirely round the hill which had the advantage of possessing the most precious monuments of Christianity. The old site having been changed into an infected marsh, so soon as an active civilization had ceased to regulate the course of the waters, the ancient city was gradually abandoned.⁴⁸ Its gigantic monuments, in consequence of their proximity to a navigable canal and to the sea, were worked as marble quarries; and in this manner the city was displaced for more than a league. Perhaps the choice of domicile made by a few poor Jews, under the reign of Claudius or Nero, was the first cause of this removal. The most ancient Turkish conquest continued the Byzantine tradition. A large Mussulman city succeeded the Christian city,⁴⁹ until ruin, fever, and oblivion came to reign definitely over so many recollections.⁵⁰

Here Paul was not, as in his first missions, in the presence of a synagogue ignorant of the new mystery, of those whom it was expected to gain over. He had before him a church which had been formed in the most original and spontaneous manner, by the assistance of two simple and honest Jewish merchants, and of a foreign doctor, who was only as yet half Christian. The group of Apollos was composed of about twelve

members. Paul questioned them, and perceived that their faith was lacking in several particulars, especially that they had not heard the Holy Ghost spoken of. Paul completed their instruction, re-baptized them in the name of Jesus, and laid hands upon them. Immediately the spirit descended upon them. They began to speak the tongues, and to prophesy like perfect Christians.⁵¹

The apostle soon strove to enlarge this little circle of believers. He had no fear to find himself in the presence of the philosophical and scientific spirit which had suddenly blocked his progress in Athens. Ephesus was not a great intellectual centre. Superstition prevailed there uncontrolled. Every one lived in the foolish prejudices of demonology and theurgy. The magic formulas of Ephesus (*Ephesia grammata*)⁵² were celebrated. Books of sorcery were abundant. A multitude of people devoted their time to these foolish puerilities.⁵³ Apollonius Tyana might have been at Ephesus about this period.⁵⁴

Paul, according to his custom, preached in the synagogue.⁵⁵ For three months, on every Saturday, did he not cease to announce the kingdom of God. He had little success. They did not proceed against him with disturbances and severities; but they received his doctrine with insulting and scornful language. He then resolved to renounce the synagogue, and he re-united his disciples by themselves in a place called *Σχολῇ Τυραννίου*.⁵⁶ Probably this was a public place, — one of those *scholæ* or semicircular archways so numerous in ancient cities, which served as *xysta* for conversation and free instruction.⁵⁷ Probably, on the contrary, the reference here is made to the private room of a person, of a grammarian, for instance, named Tyranus.⁵⁸ Generally speaking, Christianity profited very little from the *scholæ*, which were almost always connected with the *thermæ* and gymnasia. The favorite place for Christian propaganda, next to the synagogue, was the private house, the fire-side. In this vast metropolis, the preaching, nevertheless, could take place in open day.⁵⁹ For two years Paul did not cease

to speak in the *Schola Tyranni*. This prolonged instruction in a public place, or one nearly so, attracted considerable attention. In addition to this, the apostle made frequent visits to the houses of those who were converted or moved.⁶⁰ His words sought equally the Jews and the Gentiles.⁶¹ All proconsular Asia heard the name of Jesus; and several churches, suffragans of Ephesus, were established round about. They also spoke a great deal of certain miracles done by Paul. His reputation as thaumaturgist reached such a point that handkerchiefs and shirts which had touched his skin were eagerly sought for in order to be applied to the sick.⁶² It was thought that medicinal virtue was exhaled from his body, and transmitted in this manner.

The taste of the Ephesians for magic served to bring about still more shocking episodes. Paul was regarded as possessing a great power over demons. It appears that the Jewish exorcists sought to usurp his charms, and to exorcise "in the name of the Jesus whom Paul preaches."⁶³ There is related the misadventure of several of these charlatans, who pretended to be sons, or disciples, of a certain high priest Sceva.⁶⁴ Having wished to drive out a very wicked spirit, by means of the above-mentioned formula, they heard the possessed one heap gross insults upon them. Not satisfied with this, he leaped upon them, tore their clothes to pieces, and beat them unmercifully.⁶⁵ The decrease of the spirits was such, that several Jews and several Heathens believed in Jesus through so poor a motive. Above all, were conversions made among those occupied by magic.⁶⁶ Struck with the superiority of Paul's formulas, the amateurs in occult sciences went to confide their practices to him.⁶⁷ Several even took their books of magic and burnt them.⁶⁸ The price of *Ephesia grammata*, burnt in this manner,⁶⁹ is valued at 50,000 silver drachmas.

Let us turn away our gaze from these sad shadows. Everything that is done by the ignorant masses of the people is soiled with disagreeable features. Illusion and chimera are the condi-

tion of the great things created by the people. It is the work of sages alone which is pure ; but the sages usually are powerless. We have a physiology, and a system of medicine, far superior to those of St. Paul. We are free from a multitude of errors in which he indulged. Alas ! it is much to be feared that we will never do the thousandth part of what he has done. It will be only when all humanity is instructed in, and has attained to, a certain degree of positive philosophy, that human affairs will be conducted with reason. We would not be able to comprehend anything in the history of the past, if we refuse to regard as great and good, actions with which are mingled many mean and equivocal features.

CHAPTER XIII.

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA AND PHRYGIA.

THE ardor of Paul during his sojourn at Ephesus was very great.¹ Difficulties occurred every day. Adversaries were numerous and incensed.² As the church of Ephesus was not purely a creation of Paul's, it contained among its members Jewish-Christians, who, upon certain important points, energetically resisted the apostle of the Gentiles. They were like two flocks anathematizing each other, and denying each other the right to speak in the name of Jesus.³ The heathen on their side were dissatisfied with the progress of the new faith, and already symptoms of disturbances were manifesting themselves. Once, in particular, Paul ran so imminent a danger that he compares the position in which he found himself that day to that of a man exposed to wild beasts.⁴ Perhaps this incident took place at the theatre,⁵ which would render the expression entirely just. Aquila and Priscilla saved him, and risked their lives for him.⁶

The apostle forgot everything, however, for the word of God increased. The entire western part of Asia Minor, above all the basins of the Meander and the Hermus, were covered with churches toward this period; and without doubt Paul was, in a more or less direct manner, their founder. Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia,⁷ and probably Tralles,⁸ thus received the germs of the faith.⁹ These cities already contained important Jewish colonies.¹⁰ The mildness of manners, and the long *ennuis* of provincial life, in the bosom of a beautiful and rich country, for centuries deprived of all political life, and pacified even to adulation,¹¹ had prepared many souls for the joys of a pure life. The softness of Ionian manners, so contrary to national independence, was favorable to the development of moral and social questions. These good people, without military spirit,

—feminine, if I dare express it so,—were naturally Christians. Family life appears to have been very strong among them. The custom of living in the open air, and for the women upon the sill of their door, in a delightful climate, had developed a great sociability.¹² Asia with her *asiarchs*, presidents of her games and spectacles,¹³ appeared a company of pleasure, an association of divertissements and festivities.¹⁴ The Christian population still in our day is pleasing and gay. The women have clear complexions, pensive and mild eyes, beautiful blonde hair, reserved and modest ways, implying a full consciousness of their beauty.

Thus Asia became in some degree the second province of the kingdom of God. Cities in this country, independent of the monuments, were not then perhaps essentially different from what they are now,—irregular heaps of wooden houses, with porticos covered with inclined roofs, districts most generally elevated one above another, and always containing beautiful trees. The public buildings necessary in a warm country for a life of pleasure and repose presented a surprising grandeur. Here they were not, as in Syria, artificial constructions, made with very slight reference to morals,—colonnade cities, imposed upon Bedouins.¹⁵ Nowhere does the fulness of a civilization satisfied with and sure of itself, assume more imposing forms than among these “magnificent cities of Asia.”¹⁶ As often as the beautiful countries of which we are speaking are not crushed by fanaticism, war, or barbarity, they will become mistresses of the world by their wealth. They hold almost all the sources of it, and thus force the money of nobler people to accumulate among them.¹⁷ Ionia, in the first century, was very populous, and covered with cities and villages.¹⁸ The misfortunes of the period of civil wars were forgotten. Powerful associations of artisans (*ἐργασίαι, συνεργασίαι, συμβιώσεις*), similar to those of Italy and Flanders in the Middle Ages, appoint their dignitaries, erect their public monuments, raise their statues, construct public works of utility, found institutions of charity, give all kinds of signs of prosperity, of well-being, of moral

activity.¹⁹ At the side of manufacturing cities, such as Thyatira, Philadelphia, Hierapolis, devoted to the great industries of Asia, carpets, dyeing of stuffs, woollens, and leather, was developed a rich agriculture. The various products of the borders of the Hermus and Meander, the mineral wealth of the Tmolus and Messogis, source of riches to old Assyrian Lydia, had given rise, at Tralles especially, to an opulent *bourgeoisie*, who were seen to contract alliances with the kings of Asia, sometimes even raise themselves to royalty.²⁰ These *parvenus* ennobled themselves in a more skillful manner still, by their literary tastes and by their generosity.²¹ Assuredly, we must not seek either delicacy or Hellenic perfection in their works.²² One can well imagine, upon seeing such monuments of wealth, that all nobility had been lost when they were reared. Municipal spirit, however, was still very vigorous. The citizen made king, or enjoying the favors of Cæsar, sought for the offices of his city, and spent his fortune to beautify it.²³ This activity of construction was at its height at the period of St. Paul,²⁴ partly from the earthquakes which, in the reign of Tiberias especially, had desolated the country,²⁵ and which necessitated many a repairing.

One rich canton of Southern Phrygia,²⁶ in particular, the little basin of the Lycus,²⁷ a branch of the Meander, witnessed the formation of active Christian centres.²⁸ Three cities, very near to each other, Colossæ or Colassæ,²⁹ Laodicea on the Lycus, and Hierapolis,³⁰ gave life to them. Colossæ, which formerly was most important,³¹ appeared to decline.³² It was an old city which had remained faithful to ancient customs, and which did not renew itself.³³ Laodicea and Hierapolis, on the contrary, became, through the Roman domination, very important cities.³⁴ The soul of this beautiful country is Mount Cadmus,³⁵ father of all the mountains of Western Asia, with gigantic woods, full of dark precipices, and preserving its snows all the year round. The waters flowing from it support on one of the valley slopes orchards of fruit-trees, crossed by rivers abounding in fish and

enlivened by tame storks. The other side is taken up entirely by the strongest freaks of nature. The incrusting property of the waters of one of the affluents of the Lycus, and the enormous thermal river, which falls in cascades from the mountain of Hierapolis, have sterilized the plain and formed crevices, strange caverns, subterranean beds of rivers; fantastic cells, similar to petrified snow, serving as reservoir to waters which reflect all the tints of the rainbow; deep trenches, into which resounding waters fall by a series of cataracts. On this side the heat is extreme, the soil being one vast plain flagged with limestone; but upon the heights of Hierapolis, the purity of the air, the brilliant light, the view of Cadmus, floating like an Olympus in a dazzling ether; the parched summits of Phrygia, fading away into the blue sky, with a rosy tint; the opening of the valley of the Meander; the oblique profiles of Messogis; the distant white summits of Tmolus, — produce a veritable fascination. There St. Philip and Papias lived; there Epictetes was born. The entire valley of the Lycus presents the same character of dreamy mysticism. The population was not of Greek origin: it was partly Phrygian. There was also, it appears, around Cadmus, an ancient Semitic establishment, probably an annex to Lydia.³⁶ This peaceful valley, separated from the rest of the world, became a place of refuge for Christianity. Christian sentiment, as we shall see, was there submitted to grave trials.

The evangelist of these regions was Epaphroditus, or Epaphras of Colossæ, a very zealous man, a friend and collaborator of Paul.³⁷ The apostle had only passed through the valley of Lycus. He never returned there;³⁸ but these churches, composed especially of converted heathen, were not the less completely under his control.³⁹ Epaphras exercised a sort of episcopate over the three cities.⁴⁰ Nymphodorus, or Nymphas, who at Laodicea assembled a church in his house;⁴¹ the rich and beneficent Philemon, who at Colossæ presided over a similar conventicle;⁴² Appia, deaconess of this city,⁴³ probably wife of Philemon;⁴⁴ and Archippus, who here filled an important posi-

tion,⁴⁵ recognized Paul as chief. The last of these appears even to have worked directly with Paul. The apostle calls him his "fellow-soldier."⁴⁶ Philemon, Appia, and Archippus must have been related, or connected very intimately.⁴⁷

Paul's disciples travelled unceasingly, and reported everything to their master. Each faithful one, when scarcely instructed, became a zealous catechist, spreading about him the faith with which he was filled. The delicate moral aspirations which prevailed in the country spread the movement like a train of powder. The catechists went everywhere. As soon as received, they were kept as treasures. Every one was eager to provide for them.⁴⁸ A cordiality, a joy, a boundless good-will, gained one after another, and melted every heart. Judaism, however, preceded Christianity in these regions. Jewish colonies had been led there from Babylon two centuries and a half before, and had probably introduced some of those industries (the manufacture of carpets for instance), which, under the Roman Emperors, produced so much wealth, and such influential associations in the country.⁴⁹

Did the preaching of Paul and his disciples reach Great Phrygia, the region of *Æzanes*, of *Synnada*, of *Cotia*, and *Docimia*? We have seen that in his first journeys Paul preached in *Parorean Phrygia*; that in the second journey he crossed *Phrygia Epictetes*; and that in his third journey he crossed *Apamia*, *Kibotus*, and *Phrygia*, called later *Pacatianus*.

It is extremely probable that the rest of *Phrygia*, and that also *Bithynia*, were indebted to the disciples of Paul for the seeds of Christianity. Towards the year 112,⁵⁰ Christianity appears in *Bithynia*, as a deep-seated religion which had penetrated all ranks of society, which had invaded the towns and country districts as well as the cities, and brought about a long cessation of the official religion, so that the Roman authority is led to rejoice at seeing the sacrifices recommence, a few faithful ones return to the temples, and the victims find, here and there, purchasers. Towards the year 112, people questioned as to

whether they are Christians, reply that they have been, but that they had ceased to be "for more than twenty years."⁶¹ Assuredly this leads us to suppose that the first Christian preaching took place in this quarter, while Paul was yet alive.

From then, Phrygia was the essentially Christian country, and remained so three hundred years. There began the public profession of Christianity; there is found from the beginning of the third century, upon monuments exposed to the gaze of all, the word *XPIΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ*, or *XPIΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ*; ⁶² there the grave-stone inscriptions, before becoming open professions of Christianity, contain the disguised expression of Christian dogmas; ⁶³ there, from the time of Septimus Severus, large cities adopted biblical symbols for their coins, or rather, made their old traditions conform to biblical narratives.⁶⁴ A large number of the Christians from Ephesus and Rome came from Phrygia. The names which occur most frequently on the monuments of Phrygia are the old Christian names, especial names of the apostolic age, those which fill the martyrologies.⁶⁵ It is very probable that this early adoption of the doctrine of Jesus resulted from the race, and from the anterior religious institutions of the Phrygian people.⁶⁶ Apollonius of Tyana had, it is said, temples among the ingenuous inhabitants. The idea of gods clothed in human form appeared quite natural to them. What remains to us of old Phrygia frequently breathes out something religious, moral, profound, analogous to Christianity.⁶⁷ Honest laborers near Cotia make a vow "to the holy and just gods."⁶⁸ Not far from there another vow is addressed "to the holy and just God."⁶⁹ Such an epitaph in verses of this province, in no wise a classic production, incorrect and weak in form, appears impressed with entirely modern sentiment, with a sort of touching romanticism.⁶⁰ The country itself differs much from the rest of Asia. It is sad, severe, gloomy, bearing the deep impress of old geological catastrophes; burnt, or rather incinerated, or disturbed by the frequent earthquakes.⁶¹

Pontus, in Cappadocia, heard the name of Jesus about the same time.⁶² Christianity burst forth like a sudden conflagra-

tion throughout all Asia Minor. It is probable that the Jewish-Christians labored on their side to spread the Gospel there. John, who belonged to this party,⁶³ was received in Asia as an apostle of superior authority to Paul. The Apocalypse, addressed in the year 68 to the churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea on the Lycus, appears composed for the Jewish-Christians. Without doubt, between the death of Paul and the editing of the Apocalypse, there was at Ephesus and in Asia, as it were, a second Jewish-Christian preaching. Nevertheless, if Paul had been for ten years the sole chief of the churches of Asia, we cannot understand how he should have been forgotten there so soon. St. Philip⁶⁴ and Papias,⁶⁵ glories of the church of Hierapolis, Melito,⁶⁶ glory of that of Sardis, were Jewish-Christians. Neither Papias nor Polycrates of Ephesus quotes Paul. The authority of John has absorbed everything, and John is to these churches a Jewish chief priest. The churches of Asia in the second century, the church of Laodicea especially, are the scene of a controversy which attaches itself to the vital question of Christianity, and in which the traditional party shows itself not at all in harmony with the ideas of Paul.⁶⁷ Montanism is a sort of return to Judaism, in the bosom of Phrygian Christianity. In other words, in Asia, as at Corinth,⁶⁸ the memory of Paul after his death appears to have undergone a sort of eclipse during a whole century. Even the churches which he had established abandon him as too compromising a man; so much so, that Paul, in the second century, appears universally disowned.⁶⁹

This reaction must have taken place a short time after the death of the apostle, or perhaps even before. The second and third chapters of the Apocalypse are a cry of hatred against Paul and his friends. This church of Ephesus, which owes so much to Paul, is praised for "not being able to bear with them which are evil; for having tried them, which say they are apostles and are not;"⁷⁰ for having found them liars; for hating the deeds of the Nicolaitanes,"⁷¹ "which I also hate," adds the celestial voice.⁷² The church of Smyrna is congratulated for "being

the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not,⁷³ but are the synagogue of Satan.”⁷⁴ “But I have a few things against thee,” says the divine voice to the church of Pergamos, “because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication.”⁷⁵ So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of Nicolaitanes.”⁷⁶ “I have a few things against thee,” says the same voice to the church of Thyatira, “because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel,” which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants, to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. And I gave her space to repent of her fornication, and she repented not. . . . As to the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan as they speak,⁷⁸ I will put upon you none other burthen.”⁷⁹ And to the church of Philadelphia, “I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie, to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.”⁸⁰ Probably the vague reproaches addressed by the seer to the churches of Sardis and Laodicea⁸¹ also contain allusions to the great discussion which was dismembering the church of Jesus.

Still, let us say that if Paul had been the sole missionary of Asia, we could not conceive how, in a little while after his death (supposing that he was dead when the Apocalypse appeared), his adherents could be represented as in the minority. In the churches of this country, above all, could we not conceive how the church of Ephesus would have bestowed an insulting sobriquet upon him. Paul, generally speaking, forbade himself working upon the ground of others, or preaching and writing to churches which he had not established.⁸² But his enemies did not observe the same discretion. They followed him step by step, and set about destroying his work by insult and calumny.

CHAPTER XIV.

SCHISMS IN THE CHURCH OF CORINTH. — APOLLOS. — FIRST
SCANDALS.

AT the same time that he was directing for himself the vast propaganda which was gaining over Asia to the religion of Jesus, Paul was absorbed with the gravest pre-occupations. Solicitude for all the churches which he had established weighed upon him.¹ The church of Corinth, especially, caused him the greatest anxiety.² During the three or four years which had elapsed since the departure of the apostle from the port of Cenchrea, various movements had unceasingly disturbed this church. Greek levity caused phenomena here, which had not as yet been produced in any of the localities visited by Christianity.

We have seen that Apollos, after a short stay at Ephesus, where Aquila and Priscilla contributed to his Christian education, had set out for Corinth, with very pressing letters from the brethren of Asia to those of Achaia.³ The knowledge and eloquence of this new teacher were much admired by the Corinthians. Apollos equalled Paul in his knowledge of the Scriptures, and was far superior to him in literary culture. The Greek which he spoke was excellent, while that of the apostle was very defective. He had also, it appears, the exterior gifts of an orator, which were wanting in Paul, namely, imposing presence and easy flow of language. Certain it is he met with remarkable success at Corinth. His arguments with the Jews, upon the question of knowing whether Jesus was the Messiah, were regarded as very strong. He made many conversions.⁴ Apollos and St. Paul both presented distinct physiognomies in the new sect. They were the only Jews, well instructed according to the Jewish method, who had embraced the doctrine of

Jesus. But they originated in different schools. Paul was of that of Hierosolymitic Pharisaism, corrected by the liberal tendencies of Gamaliel. Apollos originated in the Jewish-Hellenic school of Alexandria, such as we know it from Philo. Probably he already taught the theories of the *logos*, and was the introducer of these theories into Christian theology. Paul had a sort of feverish ardor, that intense fanaticism which characterizes the Jew of Palestine. Natures like that of Paul only change once in a lifetime. The direction of their fanaticism once found, they follow it without any deviation or examination. Apollos, more inquisitive, of a more investigating turn of mind, was susceptible of seeking forever. He was a man of talent, rather than an apostle. But everything leads us to believe that he united great sincerity to this talent, and that he was a very winning person. At the period of his arrival in Corinth he had not yet seen Paul.⁵ It was only through Aquila and Priscilla that he knew the apostle, whose rival he was soon unconsciously to become.

Among these trivial, brilliant, superficial inhabitants of the borders of the Mediterranean, factions, parties, and divisions constitute a social necessity; without them, life appears tiresome. To procure themselves satisfaction of hating and loving, of being excited, jealous, and triumphant in turn, they often oppose each other in the most trivial things. The object of dissension is insignificant. It is the dissension which they wish, and which they seek for itself alone. Personal questions become, in such societies, most important ones. Let two preachers or two physicians meet in a little city of the South, the city divides itself into two parties concerning the merits of each of them. It is vain for the two preachers, or two physicians to be friends. They will not prevent their names from becoming the signal of animated struggles, the standard of two inimical camps.

So it was at Corinth.⁶ The talent of Apollos turned all their heads. It was a style entirely different from that of Paul. The latter conquered by his energy, his passion, the animated

impression of his ardent soul. Apollos, by his elegant language, correct and sure of itself. Several persons, ill-disposed towards Paul, and who, perhaps, did not owe their conversion to him, openly preferred Apollos. They regarded Paul as a coarse man, without education, ignorant of philosophy and literature.⁷ Apollos was their teacher; they only swore by Apollos.⁸ The faithful of Paul doubtless replied with warmth, and in disparagement of the new teacher. Although Paul and Apollos were in no wise enemies, and looked upon each other as fellow-workers; and, although there was no difference of opinion between them,⁹ their names thus became the standards of two parties, who exchanged, in spite of the two teachers,¹⁰ rather angry epithets. The bad feeling continued even after the departure of Apollos. The latter, in fact, worn out, perhaps, by the zeal displayed for him, and rising above all these petty feelings, left Corinth and returned to Ephesus. He found Paul there, with whom he had long conversations,¹¹ and established relations which, without being those of a disciple or intimate friend,¹² were those of two great souls, worthy of understanding and loving each other.

This was not the only cause of trouble. Corinth was a locality much frequented by foreigners. The port of Cenchrea witnessed the daily landing of multitudes of Jews and Syrians, several of whom were already Christians, but of another school than that of Paul, and but slightly well-disposed towards that of the apostle. The emissaries of the church of Jerusalem, whom we have already met at Antioch and in Galatia upon the footsteps of Paul, had reached Corinth. These new-comers, great talkers, full of boasting,¹³ furnished with letters of recommendation from the apostles at Jerusalem,¹⁴ rose up against Paul, created suspicions concerning his uprightness,¹⁵ undervalued or denied his title of apostle,¹⁶ and carried their rudeness to the point of sustaining that Paul himself did not really believe that he was an apostle, since he did not profit by the ordinary privileges of the apostolate.¹⁷ His disinterestedness

was used against him. They represented him as a vain, inconstant man, talking and threatening a great deal without effect. They reproached him with glorifying himself upon every occasion, — with appealing to pretended divine favors.¹⁸ They denied his visions.¹⁹ In this connection, they insisted that Paul had not known Jesus,²⁰ that consequently he had no right to speak about him.

At the same time, they dwelt upon the apostles at Jerusalem, especially James and Peter, as the true apostles, the *arch-apostles*,²¹ in a certain sense.²² The new-comers, from the mere fact of their being from Jerusalem, claimed to be in connection with Christ after the flesh, inasmuch as they were connected with James, and with those whom Christ had chosen in his lifetime.²³ They sustained that God had established a single teacher, namely, Christ, by whom the twelve were instituted.²⁴ Proud of their circumcision and Jewish descent,²⁵ they strove to tighten as much as possible the yoke of legal observances.²⁶ Thus there was at Corinth, as almost everywhere, a party "favoring Peter." The division was profound. "I am of Paul," said some. "I am of Apollos," said others. "I am of Peter," said the third party. Finally, a few, wishing to display minds superior to these disputes, invented rather an ingenious expression. They created, as a designation for themselves, the name of "party of Christ." When the discussion grew warm, and the names of Paul, Apollos, and Peter were mingled in the contest, they intervened with the name of the forgotten one. "I am of Christ," said they;²⁷ and, as all these Hellenic juvenilities did not exclude, at the bottom, a true Christian sentiment, the recollection of Jesus thus brought up exercised a powerful effect in restoring concord. The name of this "party of Christ" implied, nevertheless, somewhat of hostility against the apostle, and a certain ingratitude, since those who urged it against "those of Paul" seemed to wish to destroy the trace of an apostolate, to which they owed their knowledge of Christ.

Contact with the heathen could not cause the slightest danger

to the young church. These dangers resulted from the Greek philosophy, and the bad morals which, to a certain extent, besieged the church, penetrated into it, and undermined it on all sides. We have already seen that, at Athens, philosophy arrested the progress of Paul's preaching. Corinth was far from being a city of so high a culture as Athens; nevertheless, it contained many instructed people who received the new dogmas very badly. The cross, the resurrection, the approaching regeneration of all things, appeared to them follies and absurdities.²⁸ Several of the faithful were shaken; or, in order to undertake impossible conciliations, altered the Gospel.²⁹ The irreconcilable struggle between positive science and the supernatural elements of the Christian faith began.

This struggle will end only by the complete extinction of positive science in the Christian world in the sixth century. The same struggle with positive science will begin anew upon the threshold of modern times.

The general immorality of Corinth exercised disastrous effects upon the church. Several Christians had not been able to free themselves from loose habits, which, in consequence of being prevalent, had almost ceased to appear wrong.³⁰ There was mention of strange and, until then, unheard-of scandals in the assembly of the saints. The bad morals of the city scaled the walls of the church and corrupted it. The Jewish regulations upon marriage, of which all portions of the Christian church advocated the imperative and absolute character,³¹ were violated.³² Such a Christian lived publicly with his step-mother. A spirit of vanity, frivolity, wrangling, and foolish pride, prevailed with several.³³ It appeared as if there was no other church in the world, so much did this community walk in its own paths, without any regard for the others.³⁴ The gifts of the Spirit, glossology, prophetic preaching, the gift of miracles, — elsewhere subjects of so much edification, here degenerated into disgraceful scenes.³⁵ They grew jealous of each other.³⁶ The inspired ones of different classes interrupted each other

in an indecent manner.³⁷ Hence there resulted strange disorders in the church.³⁸ The women, elsewhere so submissive, were here bold, and almost claimed equality with men. They wished to pray aloud, and prophesy in the church, and that too, unveiled, their long hair hanging down, making the assembly a witness of their rapture, their soft delirium, and their pious grace of manner.³⁹

But it was above all the *agapæ*, or mystic feasts, which gave rise to the most flagrant abuses. The scenes of luxurious feasting which followed heathen sacrifices were reproduced here.⁴⁰ Instead of having everything in common, each one ate the part which he had brought; some went out almost intoxicated, the others still hungry. The poor were covered with shame, the rich with their abundance appeared to insult those who had nothing. The recollection of Jesus, and the high signification which he had attached to this repast, appeared blotted out.⁴¹ The material condition of the church was, moreover, quite bad; there were many sick, and several were dead.⁴² The cases of death, in the state in which minds were, caused a great deal of surprise and hesitation.⁴³ The sicknesses were regarded as afflictions or chastisements.⁴⁴

Is it to be said, that four years had sufficed to remove all the virtue from the work of Jesus? Assuredly not. There were still edifying families, in particular that of Stephanas, which had entirely devoted itself to the service of the church and was a model of evangelical activity.⁴⁵ But the conditions of Christian society were already much changed. The little church of saints of the last day had been thrown into a corrupt, frivolous, and in no wise mystical world. There were already bad Christians. Time was past in which Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead for having kept back a little sum. The sacred repast of Jesus became a revel, and the earth did not open to swallow up him who went reeling from the table of the Lord.

These bad reports reached Paul one after the other, and filled him with sorrow. The first rumors merely mentioned several

transgressions against morality. Paul wrote an epistle on this subject which has not reached us.⁴⁶ In it he forbade the faithful to have any connection with the persons whose lives were not pure. Ill-disposed persons affected to assign a meaning to this order, which rendered it impossible to be obeyed. "Only have connection in Corinth," said they, "with irreproachable people?" . . . "But what is he thinking of? It is not alone Corinth, but the world too, that it would be necessary to leave." Paul was obliged to recur to this order, and explain it.

A little later, probably in April,⁴⁷ he learned of the dissensions which were agitating the church, through brethren whom he calls "those of the house of Chloe."⁴⁸ Precisely at this moment he was thinking of leaving Ephesus.⁴⁹ Motives of which we are ignorant retaining him there for some time, he sent his disciple Timothy⁵⁰ to Greece in advance of himself, with powers equal to his own, and accompanied by several brethren;⁵¹ among others, a certain Erastus, probably a different one from the treasurer of Corinth, who bore the same name.⁵² Although the principal object of their journey was Corinth, they went by way of Macedonia.⁵³ Paul intended himself to take this route,⁵⁴ and according to his custom he made his disciples precede him, in order to announce his arrival.

A short while after the message from Chloe, and before Timothy and his companions had arrived at Corinth,⁵⁵ new envoys from this city arrived in search of Paul.⁵⁶ They were the deacon Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus,⁵⁷ three men very dear to the apostle. Stephanas was, according to the expression of the apostle, "the first fruits of Asia;" and since the departure of Aquila and Priscilla he occupied the first rank in the community, or at least in the party of Paul. The envoys brought a letter asking explanations upon the previous epistle of Paul, and solutions for divers cases of conscience—in particular, regarding marriage, meats sacrificed to idols, the spiritual exercises, and gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁸ The three deputies gave a detailed description of the abuses which had

crept in. The grief of the apostle was very great, and, without the consolations given him by the pious messengers,⁶⁰ he would have been moved with anger against so much weakness. He had fixed upon the time of his departure after Pentecost,⁶⁰ which may have been about two months distant,⁶¹ but he wished to go by way of Macedonia.⁶² He could not, therefore, reach Macedonia before three months. He immediately resolved to write to the ailing church, and to reply to the questions put to him. As he did not have Timothy with him, he took as secretary a disciple unknown in fact, named Sosthenes; and, by way of a delicate attention, he wished that the name of this disciple should occur in the superscription of the letter alongside of his own.⁶³

It begins by an appeal to concord, and under the appearance of humility, by an apology for his preaching:—

“Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.

“Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?

“I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius;

“Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.

“And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

“For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

“For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God.

“For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.⁶⁴

“Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

“For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom

knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

“For the Jews require a sign,⁶⁵ and the Greeks seek after wisdom :

“But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness ;

“But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

“Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men ; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

“For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called :

“But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise ; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty ;

“And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are :

“That no flesh should glory in his presence. . . .

“And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God.

“For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.

“And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.

“And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power :⁶⁶

“That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

“Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect : yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought :

“But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory ;

“Which none of the princes of this world knew : for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

“But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

“But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit : for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

“For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

“Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God ; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth ; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him : neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

“But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.

“And I, Brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ.

“I have fed you with milk, and not with meat : for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.

“For ye are yet carnal : for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?

“For while one saith, I am of Paul ; and another, I am of Apollos ; are ye not carnal?

“Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?

“I have planted, Apollos watered ; but God gave the increase.

“So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth ; but God that giveth the increase. . . .

“For we are laborers together with God : ye are God’s husbandry, ye are God’s building.

“According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

“For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. . . .

“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ? . . .

“Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

“For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God : for it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.⁶⁷

“And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain.⁶⁸

“Therefore let no man glory in men ;⁶⁹ for all things are yours ;

“Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come ; all are yours ;

“And ye are Christ’s ; and Christ is God’s.

“Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. . . .

“But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man’s judgment ; yea, I judge not mine own self. . . . But he that judgeth me is the Lord. . . .

“Therefore judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts : and then shall every man have praise of God.

“And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes, that ye might learn in us

not to think of men above that which is written,⁷⁰ that no one of you be puffed up for one against another. . . .

“Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us;⁷¹ and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you.

“For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.

“We are fools for Christ’s sake, but ye are wise in Christ; we are weak, but ye are strong; ye are honorable, but we are despised.

“Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place;

“And labor, working with our own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it:

“Being defamed, we entreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day.

“I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn you.

“For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.

“Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me.

“For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church.

“Now some are puffed up, as though I would not come to you.

“But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power.

“For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.

“What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?”

With this general apology, the apostle attacks each one of the abuses mentioned to him, and each one of the questions

asked. He is extremely severe on the subject of fornication.⁷²

“It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father’s wife.

“And ye are puffed up and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you.

“For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed,

“In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,

“To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

There is no question of doubt. It is a sentence of death that Paul pronounces.⁷³ Terrible legends were circulating in regard to the effect of excommunications.⁷⁴ We must remember, moreover, that Paul seriously believed himself to be doing miracles. In only delivering up to Satan the body of the guilty one, he doubtless believed himself to be indulgent.

The order which Paul had given in a previous letter (lost) to the Corinthians to avoid all connections with the fornicators had given rise to misunderstandings. Paul sets forth his idea.⁷⁵ The Christian is not to judge them that are without, but he is to be severe for them that are within. A single spot upon the purity of life is to be sufficient to exclude one from society. It is forbidden to eat with such a one. We see that it is of a convent, of a congregation of pious persons occupied in watching and judging each other, rather than of a church in the modern sense of the word, that such an organization reminds us. Every church, in the eyes of the apostle, is responsible for the errors committed in its midst. This exaggerated rigorism was justified in ancient society, which sinned by entirely different excesses. But we feel how much such an idea of sanctity possesses of contractedness, illiberality, and spirit contrary to the morality

of him formerly called the "upright man"—a morality, the fundamental principle of which is to occupy one's self as little as possible with the conduct of others. The only question to know is, whether a society can hold together without censorship over private morals, and whether the future will not bring something similar to ecclesiastical discipline, which modern liberalism has so jealously suppressed.

The ideal type of moral perfection, according to Paul, is a mild, upright, chaste, sober, charitable man, freed from wealth.⁷⁶ Humility of station and poverty are almost requisite to be a Christian. The words covetous, extortioner, thief, are almost synonymous; at least the vices which they designate have the same blame attached to them.⁷⁷ The antipathy of this little community for the high society of the world was strange. Paul, following in this respect Jewish tradition,⁷⁸ blames the fact of bringing a suit before the unjust as an act unworthy of the faithful.

"Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?"

"Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? . . .

"Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?"

"If, then, ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

"I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?"

"But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.

"Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather *suffer yourselves to be defrauded?*

"Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that *your* brethren.

The rule in regard to the natural relations between man and woman excited the gravest difficulties. This was the constant pre-occupation of the apostle when he wrote to the Corinthians. The coldness of Paul gives to his morality something rational, but monastic and contracted. Sexual attraction is in his eye an evil, a shame. Since it can not be suppressed, it must be regulated. Nature, in St. Paul's mind, is bad, and grace consists in contradicting and subduing it. He has, nevertheless, some beautiful expressions concerning the respect man owes to his body; God will raise it up, the bodies of the faithful are the temple of the holy spirits, the members of Christ. What a crime to take members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot.⁷⁹ Absolute chastity is that which is worth the most.⁸⁰ Virginity is the perfect state. Marriage was established as a lesser evil. But as soon as it is contracted, the two parties have equal rights over each other. Conjugal relations are not to be interrupted except for a time, and in consideration of religious duties. Divorce is forbidden, except in cases of mixed marriages, in which the unbelieving party departs first.

Marriages contracted between Christians and unbelievers may be continued. The believing wife sanctifies the unbelieving husband; the believing husband sanctifies the unbelieving wife; in the same manner the children are sanctified by their parents. Furthermore, it is to be hoped that the believing one will convert the other. But new marriages can only take place between Christians.⁸¹ All these questions presented themselves in the most singular light, since it was believed that the end of the world was approaching.⁸² In the state of crisis in which they were, pregnancy and the suckling of children appeared to be anomalies.⁸³ Very few marriages took place within the sect,⁸⁴ and one of the worst consequences for those who became affiliated with it was the impossibility of marrying their daughters. Many murmured, finding this unseemly and contrary to custom.⁸⁵ To prevent greater evils,⁸⁶ and out of regard for fathers of families who had daughters past the flower of their age⁸⁷ on their hands,

Paul allows marriage. But he does not conceal the scorn and disgust inspired within him by this state, which he deems disagreeable, full of trouble, and humiliating.

“But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none;

“And they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not;

“And they that use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away.

“But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord:

“But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife.

“There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

“And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.”⁸⁸

Religious exaltation always produces such sentiments. Orthodox Judaism, which, nevertheless, made opposition to celibacy and raised marriage to a duty,⁸⁹ had doctors who reasoned like Paul. “Why should I marry?” said Rabbi Ben Azai; “I am in love with the law; the world can be peopled without me.”⁹⁰ Later, from what appears, Paul expressed much correcter ideas on this subject, and regarded the union between man and woman as a symbol of the love of Christ and his church.⁹¹ He instituted as a supreme law of marriage, love on the part of the man, submission on the part of the woman. He called to mind that admirable page of Genesis,⁹² in which the myste-

rious attraction between the two sexes is explained by a philosophical fable of divine beauty.

The question of meats coming from heathen sacrifices is solved by St. Paul with great good sense.⁹³ The Jewish-Christians held that such meats should be absolutely abstained from, and it appears that it had been agreed upon, in the Council of Jerusalem, that every one should avoid them.⁹⁴ Paul was more liberal. According to him, the fact that a piece of meat had formed part of a sacrificed beast is insignificant. The false gods not being anything, the meat which is offered to them does not thereby become defiled. It was lawful, therefore, to buy promiscuously all meat offered in the market, without asking any question as to the origin of each piece. Nevertheless, a reserve is to be exercised; there are scrupulous consciences which consider this idolatry. Now, the enlightened man is not only to be guided by principles, but by charity. He should abstain from things which he knows to be lawful, because the weak are offended by it. Knowledge puffs up, but charity edifies. Everything is permitted to the enlightened man, but everything is not expedient; all things do not edify.⁹⁵ One must not think of himself alone: he must also think of the others. This is one of the favorite ideas of Paul, and the explanation of several of the episodes of his life, in which he is seen to subject himself, out of regard for timorous persons, to observances upon which he places no importance. "If the meat which I eat," says he, "harmless as it is, offend my brother, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth."

A few faithful ones, nevertheless, went a little too far. Influenced by their family connections, they took part in the repasts which followed sacrifices, and which were held in the temples. Paul blames this custom, and, according to a manner of reasoning which is familiar to him, sets out with a principle different from the one which he had just admitted. The gods of the people are devils: to participate in their sacrifices is

to have connection with devils. One cannot at the same time partake of the Lord's table, and the table of devils,—drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils.⁹⁵ Repasts which take place in the houses are not of so much consequence. One should neither refuse to go, nor be worried about the origin of the meats. If it be said that a meat was offered in sacrifice unto the gods, it is to be abstained from, lest it give rise to scandal.⁹⁷ In general, are they to avoid what might be a stumbling-block to the Jew, the Gentile, and the Christian. In intercourse, to place their liberty subordinate to that of others, at the same time maintaining their own rights, and striving to please all men and all things.⁹⁸

“Am I not an apostle? Am I not free? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? Are not ye my work in the Lord?

“If I be not an apostle⁹⁹ unto others, yet doubtless I am to you; for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.

“Mine answer to them that do examine me is this, :

“Have we not power to eat and to drink?

“Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

“Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?

“Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? . . .

“If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?

“If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. . . .

“For though I preach this gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!

“For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto me.

“What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel.

“For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.

“And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law;

“To them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law.

“To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men,¹⁰⁰ that I might by all means save some. . . .

“Know ye not that they which run in a race¹⁰¹ run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain.

“And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things.¹⁰² Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible.

“I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air:

“But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.”¹⁰³

As to the question of the position of women in the church, it is to be expected that the apostle would decide it with his marked severity. He blames the bold attempts of the women of Corinth, and reminds them of the practice of other communities.¹⁰⁴ They are never to speak or to ask questions in the church. The gift of tongues is not for them. They are to be submissive to their husbands.¹⁰⁵ If they desire to know anything, they are to ask their husbands at home. It is as much a shame for a woman to appear in church without a veil, as to appear shorn or shaven.¹⁰⁶ The veils were moreover necessary, on account of the angels.¹⁰⁷ They supposed angels present

at divine service,¹⁰⁸ and susceptible of being tempted at the sight of women's hair,¹⁰⁹ or at least, being distracted by this sight from their duty, which is, to carry the prayers of the saints to God.¹¹⁰ "The head of man is Christ, the head of the woman is man, the head of Christ is God. . . . Man ought not to cover his head forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but, the woman is the glory of the man. The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. . . . All things are of God."¹¹¹

The observations relative to the "Lord's Supper,"¹¹² possess very great historical interest. This repast became more and more the essential part of Christian worship. More and more did the idea gain ground that it was Jesus himself whom they ate there. This was, doubtless, metaphorical.¹¹³ But metaphor, in the Christian language of this period, was not absolutely distinct from reality. At any rate, this sacrament was pre-eminently a sacrament of unity and love.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

"For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.

"Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"¹¹⁴

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread:

"And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

"After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.

“Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

“But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.

“For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body.”¹¹⁵

This judgment which one incurs by not worthily observing the high sanctity of the Lord’s Supper, is not eternal damnation. They are temporal punishments, or even death,—death often being an expiation which saves the soul.¹¹⁶ “For this cause,” adds the apostle, “many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.” That is to say, damned in eternity. For the moment the apostle confines himself to directing that those who go to the *agapæ* should tarry one for the other, that they should eat at home, to satisfy the appetite, and that they preserve for the Lord’s Supper its mystic signification.¹¹⁷ He will set the rest in order upon his arrival.

The apostle then traces the theory of the manifestations of the Spirit.¹¹⁸ Under the ill-defined terms “gifts,”¹¹⁹ “administrations,”¹²⁰ and “operations,”¹²¹ he arranges thirteen functions, constituting the entire hierarchy, and all the forms of supernatural activity. Three functions are precisely indicated, and made subordinate one to the other. They are, first, the function of apostle; second, that of prophet; third, that of teacher.¹²² Then come the gifts, the administrations, or the powers; which, without conferring a so permanently elevated character, served for the perpetual manifestations of the Spirit.¹²³ They are, first, the word of wisdom;¹²⁴ second, the word of knowledge;¹²⁵ third, the faith;¹²⁶ fourth, the gift of healing;¹²⁷ fifth, the power of working miracles;¹²⁸ sixth, the discerning of spirits;¹²⁹ seventh, the gift of speaking divers kind of

tongues ;¹³⁰ eighth, interpretation of tongues ;¹³¹ ninth, the works of charity ;¹³² tenth, the administrative cares.¹³³ All these administrations are good, useful, and necessary. They should not strive to lower each other, nor should they envy each other. They have a common source. All the "gifts" come from the Holy Spirit ; all the "administrations" emanate from Christ ; all the "operations" come from God. The body has several members, nevertheless it is one. The division of administrations is necessary in the church, as in the body. These administrations cannot do without each other any more than the eye can do without the hand, the head without the feet. All jealousy between them, is, therefore, out of place. Without doubt they are not equal in dignity, but it is exactly the weakest members which are the most necessary. It is the most humble members which are the most honored, the most particularly cared for : God having wished to establish in this respect, a compensation, in order that there should be no schism and jealousy in the body. The members, therefore, should care for one another. If one suffers, all suffer ; the advantages and glories of the one are the advantages and glories of the other. Of what advantage, moreover, these rivalries ? There is one way open for all, and which is the best,—one gift which has an immense superiority over the others.

Borne along by a truly prophetic inspiration, beyond the mingled ideas and aberrations, Paul then wrote this admirable page, the only one of all Christian literature which might be compared with the discourses of Jesus.

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

"And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge ; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

“And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

“Charity suffereth long, and is kind ; charity envieth not ; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up,

“Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil ;

“Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth ;

“Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

“Charity never faileth : but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail ; whether there be tongues, they shall cease ; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

“For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

“But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

“When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child ; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

“For now we see through a glass, darkly ; but then face to face : now I know in part ; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

“And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three ; but the greatest of these is charity.”

Had he been versed in experimental psychology, Paul would have proceeded a little further. He would have said, “Brethren, put away illusions. These inarticulate stammerings, these ecstasies, these miracles, are the dreams of your childhood. But what is not chimerical, what is eternal,—that, I have just been preaching to you.” But then he would not have belonged to his age ; he would not have done what he had done. Is it not a great deal to have pointed out this most important distinction between those eternal religious truths, which do not fall,¹³⁴ and those which do fall, like the thoughts of childhood ? Is it not

having done enough for immortality to have written those words, "The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life"? ¹³⁵ Woe to him who would stop at the surface; and who, for two or three chimerical gifts, would forget that in this strange enumeration among the *diaconies* and *charismata* of the primitive church, are found the care of those who suffer the administration of the revenue for the poor, and the giving of mutual assistance. Paul enumerates these administrations towards the last, and as if they were humble things. But his piercing glance, here again, can see the truth. "Take care," says he, "our less honorable members are precisely the most honored ones." Prophets, speakers of languages, teachers, ye will pass away. Deacons, devoted widows, administrators of the goods of the church, ye will remain, ye build for eternity.

In the detail of prescriptions relative to spiritual exercises, Paul displays his practical mind. ¹³⁶ He openly places prophecy above the gift of tongues. Without absolutely rejecting glossology, he makes reflections on the subject, which amount to a reprimand. The glossologist does not speak to men; he speaks to God. No one understands him; he only edifies himself. Prophecy, on the contrary, serves as edification and consolation for all. Glossology is only good when it is interpreted; that is to say, if other faithful ones, especially gifted in this respect, intervene and are able to interpret a meaning. Of itself, it is like indistinct music, in which the sound of a flute or cithera is heard, but not the piece played by these instruments. It is like an injured trumpet,—it sounds in vain; for as it does not sound clearly, no one obeys this uncertain signal, and prepares for battle. If the tongue does not give sounds distinctly articulated, it only strikes the air. A discourse in a tongue which one does not understand has no effect upon the intelligence. Thus, there can be no glossology without interpretation. And more, glossology is of itself sterile; with it, intelligence remains without fruit; prayer takes place within you without your knowing it.

“Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?

“For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.

“I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all:

“Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.¹³⁷

“Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men. . . .

“If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

“But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all:

“And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth.

“How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.

“If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret.

“But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

“Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.

“If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.

“For ye may all prophesy one by one that all may learn, and all may be comforted.

“And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.

“For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.

“Let your women keep silence in the churches ; for it is not permitted unto them to speak ; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

“And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home : for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

“What ! came the word of God out from you ? or came it unto you only ?

“If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.

“But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.

“Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.

“Let all things be done decently and in order.”

Several strange sounds uttered by the glossologists, in which were mingled Greek, Syriac, the words *anathema*, *maran atha*, the names of *Jesus*, and “Lord,” much embarrassed the simple people. Paul, consulted upon this subject, practises what they called “discernment of spirits,” and strives to untangle from this confused jargon what does come and what does not come from the spirit.¹³⁸

The fundamental dogma of the primitive church, the resurrection, and the approaching end of the world, occupies a considerable place in this epistle. The apostle resumes it eight or nine different times.¹³⁹ The regeneration will be accomplished by fire.

The saints will be judges of the world, and even angels. The resurrection, which, of all Christian dogmas, was the most repugnant to the Greek mind, is the object of particular attention.¹⁴⁰ Several, while admitting the resurrection of Jesus, his approaching coming, and the regeneration which he was going to bring about, did not believe in the resurrection of the dead.

When there was a death in the community, it was a scandal and an embarrassment for them. Paul had no difficulty in proving their inconsistency. If the dead are not raised, neither

was Christ raised. All hope is vain ; the Christians are the most to be pitied of all men. They are the true sages who say, " Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The resurrection of Jesus is the guarantee of the resurrection of all. Jesus has begun the march ; his disciples will follow him upon the day of his glorious manifestation ; then will commence the reign of Christ. All other power, excepting his, will be destroyed. Death will be the last enemy that he will conquer. All will be subject to him, excepting God, who did put all things under him. The Son in truth will hasten to render homage to God, to subject himself to him, in order that God may be all in all.

" But some man will say, How are the dead raised up ? and with what body do they come ?

" Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die :

" And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain ; it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain :

" But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.

" All flesh is not the same flesh : but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.

" There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial : but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.

" There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars ; for one star differeth from another star in glory.

" So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption :

" It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory : it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power :

" It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body ; and there is a spiritual body.

“And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul ; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.

“Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural ; and afterward that which is spiritual.

“The first man is of the earth, earthy : the second man is the Lord from heaven.

“As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy : and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.

“Behold, I shew you a mystery ; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,¹⁴¹

“In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump : for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

“For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

“So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.¹⁴²

“O death, where is thy sting?¹⁴³ O grave, where is thy victory?

“The sting of death is sin ; and the strength of sin is the law.

“But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Alas ! the Christ did not come. All of them died, one after the other. Paul, who believed himself to be one of those who would live until the great coming,¹⁴⁴ died in his turn. We shall see how neither faith nor hope was made to pause by this. No experience, how disheartening soever it may be, appears decisive to humanity, when there is question of those sacred dogmas upon which she bases, not without reason, her consolation and her joy. It is easy for us to find, too late, that these hopes were exaggerated : it is fortunate, at least, that those who shared them were not so clairvoyant. Paul has naively told us that if he had not reckoned upon the resurrection, he would

have led the life of a simple citizen, entirely occupied with every-day pleasures.¹⁴⁵ A few sages of the first order, Marcus Aurelius and Spinoza, for instance, have gone further, and have practised the highest virtue without hope of remuneration. But the multitude is never heroic. There was needed a generation of men persuaded that they would not die. There was needed the attraction of a great and immediate reward in order to draw out from man that enormous sum of devotion and sacrifice which established Christianity. The great chimera of the coming kingdom of God, was thus the creative and mother idea of the new religion. We shall soon witness the transformations which the necessity of things will force this belief to undergo. Towards the years 54-58, it had reached its highest degree of intensity. All the letters of Paul written about this period, are, so to express it, impregnated with it. The two Syriac words *maran-atha* (the Lord is about to come),¹⁴⁶ became the watchword of the Christians among themselves: the short, animated expression, which they passed from one to another, to encourage themselves in their hoping.¹⁴⁷

CHAPTER XV.

CONTINUATION OF THE THIRD MISSION OF PAUL. — THE GREAT COLLECTION. — DEPARTURE FROM EPHESUS.

PAUL, according to his custom, added to the end of his letter, — “*The salutation of me Paul, with mine own hand. If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema MARAN ATHA.*”

He entrusted his letter to Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, who had brought him that of the Corinthians. Paul thought that the three deputies would arrive at Corinth about the same time as Timothy. He was fearful lest the youth and timidity of his disciple should be badly dealt with in the scoffing society of Corinth,¹ and they should not accord him sufficient authority. The apostle recommended in the most earnest manner that they should treat Timothy as they would himself, and expressed the desire that they should send him back as soon as possible. He did not wish to leave Ephesus without this valued companion, whose presence had become a sort of necessity to him.

Paul urged Apollos strongly to join Stephanas and return to Corinth, but Apollos preferred to postpone his departure.² From this moment, he is lost from view. Tradition, nevertheless, continues to regard him as a disciple of Paul's.³ It is probable, in fact, that he continued his apostolic career, giving his Jewish erudition and elegant language to the service of Christian doctrine.

Paul, nevertheless, formed boundless projects,⁴ in which he imagined, according to his constant custom that he saw directions of the Spirit. There happened to Paul, what often happens to persons accustomed to one kind of activity. He could no longer do without that which had been the occupation

of his life. Travelling had become a necessity to him. He sought occasion for it. He wished to revisit Macedonia and Achaia, then visit Jerusalem once more; then set out again to attempt new missions in more distant countries, and those until now not reached by the faith,—such as Italy and Spain.⁵ The idea of going to Rome gave him no rest.⁶ “I must also see Rome,” he was often accustomed to say. He divined that the centre of Christianity would one day be there; or, at least, that decisive events would take place there. The journey to Jerusalem was connected with another project, which had occupied his mind a great deal for a year back.

In order to calm the jealous susceptibilities of the church of Jerusalem, and to accede to one of the conditions of the peace which was signed at the interview in the year 51,⁸ Paul had prepared a great collection in the churches of Asia Minor and Greece. We have already seen that one of the bonds which mark the dependence of provincial churches in regard to those of Judea was the obligation of alms. The church of Jerusalem, partly through the fault of those who composed it, was always in distress. Mendicants were numerous in it.⁹ At a more ancient period, the characteristic feature of Jewish society had been its freedom from wretchedness and large fortunes. For two or three centuries, there had been rich men in Jerusalem, consequently poor ones. The true Jew, turning his back upon profane civilization, became from day to day more destitute of resources. The public works of Agrippa II. had filled the city with famished masons. They demolished solely in order not to leave the thousands of artisans without work.¹⁰ The apostles and their surroundings suffered, like every one else, from this state of affairs. It was necessary that the suffragan churches, active and laborious, should prevent these people from dying of hunger.¹¹ While supporting with impatience the pretensions of the brethren of Judea, they none the less recognized in the provinces their supremacy and their titles of nobility. Paul had the highest regard for them. “You are their debtors,” said he to

his faithful ones. "If the Gentiles have been made partakers of the saints of Judea, in the spiritual order, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things."¹² It was, moreover, an imitation of a custom which had existed for a long time among the Jews in all parts of the world, to send contributions to Jerusalem.¹³ Paul thought that a large offering carried by himself to the apostles would cause him to be better received by the whole college, which pardoned him with such difficulty for performing great things without them, and would be in the eyes of these famished nobles the best mark of subordination. How could they treat as schismatic and rebellious those who gave proof of so much generosity, of such fraternal and respectful sentiments?¹⁴

Paul began to organize the collection in the year 56.¹⁵ He then wrote about it, first to the Corinthians,¹⁶ then to the Galatians,¹⁷ and then, without doubt, to the other churches. He resumed the subject in his new letter to the Corinthians.¹⁸ There was moderate wealth in the churches of Asia Minor and Greece, but no great fortunes. Paul knew the economical habits of the country where he had lived. The persistence with which he represents his food and support as a heavy burthen, with which he did not wish to oppress the churches, proves that he too shared these meagre attentions of poor people, obliged to be careful of everything. He thought that, if in the churches of Greece they postponed the collection till his arrival, the thing would work badly. He wished, therefore, that on Sunday every one should lay aside a saving proportionate to his means for this holy purpose. This little treasure of charity was to go on increasing while awaiting his arrival. Then the churches should choose deputies,¹⁹ and Paul would send them with letters of recommendation to carry the offering to Jerusalem. Perhaps even, if the result should be worth the trouble, Paul would go in person, and then the deputies would accompany him. So much honor and happiness, going to Jerusalem, seeing the apostles, travelling in company with Paul, made all the believers leap for

joy. An emulation in doing good, wisely excited by the great master in the art of directing souls, kept every one on the alert. This collection was for months the thought which sustained life, and made every heart beat.

Timothy soon returned from Ephesus, as Paul had desired.²⁰ He brought news subsequent to the departure of Stephanas; but we are led to believe that he had left the city before Stephanas returned, for it is from Titus that Paul later learns the effect produced by his new letter.²¹ The situation at Corinth was still very unfavorable. Paul modified his projects, resolved to stop first at Corinth, remain there a short while, to accomplish then his tour in Macedonia, to make a second and longer stay at Corinth, and then, resuming his first plan, to set out for Jerusalem, accompanied by the Corinthian deputies.²² He thought it a duty to inform the church of Corinth immediately of this change of resolution. He charged Titus with the message, and with the most delicate communications for the revolted church.²³ The disciple was at the same time to press the completion of the collection ordered by Paul.²⁴ Titus, from what appears, refused at first. He feared, like Timothy,²⁵ the reckless and inconsiderate character of the people of Corinth. Paul reassured him, told him what he thought of the qualities of the Corinthians, extenuated their faults, dared to promise him a good reception.²⁶ He gave him for a companion a "brother" whose name is unknown to us.²⁷ Paul had reached the last days of his sojourn at Ephesus. Nevertheless, it was agreed that he should await in the city the return of Titus.

But new trials came to oblige him to modify his designs once more. Few days in the life of Paul were more troubled than these.²⁸ For the first time, he found the measure too great, and confessed his strength was gone.²⁹ Jews,³⁰ heathen,³¹ and Christians hostile to his movements,³² appeared conspired against him. The situation of the church at Corinth gave him a sort of fever. He dispatched thither courier upon courier. He changed his resolution in her regard every day. Sickness probably set in:

he thought he was dying.³³ A disturbance which took place at Ephesus tended still more to complicate his situation, and to oblige him to set out without awaiting the return of Titus.³⁴

The temple of Diana offered a fearful obstacle to the new preaching. This gigantic establishment, one of the wonders of the world, was the life and the claim to life of the whole city. By its enormous riches,³⁵ by the number of strangers which it attracted, by the privileges and celebrity which it gained for the city, by the splendid festivities to which it gave rise, by the callings which it supported.³⁶ Superstition had here the surest of guarantees, that of gross interest,—always so happy to cover itself with the pretext of religion.

One of the industries of the city of Ephesus was that of the silversmiths, who manufactured little *naoi* of Diana. Strangers carried away with them these objects, which, afterwards laid upon their tables or in the interior of their houses, represented to them the celebrated sanctuary.³⁷ A large number of workmen were employed in this manner. Like all artisans living upon the piety of pilgrims, these workmen were very fanatical. To preach a religion subversive of the one which was enriching them, appeared to them a frightful sacrilege. It was as if, in our day, they should go and declaim against the worship of the Virgin at Fourvières, or at La Sallette. One of the ways in which they summed up the new doctrine, was, "The gods made with the hands of man, were no gods." This doctrine had obtained sufficient publicity in order to cause anxiety among the silversmiths. Their chief, named Demetrius, excited them to make a violent manifestation, maintaining above all that the honor of a temple revered by Asia and the whole world, was at stake. The workmen thronged the streets, crying, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" and in a little while the whole city was filled with confusion.

The crowd rushed into the theatre—the usual place for assemblies. The theatre of Ephesus—the immense interior of which, despoiled of almost all its constructions, is still visible on

the sides of Mount Prion³⁸—was probably the largest in the world. It is estimated to have contained at least 56,000 persons.³⁹ As the high seats were on a level with the hill, an enormous crowd could, in an instant, enter by the top and fill everything. The lower part of the theatre, moreover, was surrounded by colonnades and porticos, filled with idlers; it was in the neighborhood of the forum, the market, and several gymnasia,⁴⁰ and always open. The tumult reached its height in an instant. Two Christians of Thessalonica, Gaius and Aristarchus, who had joined Paul at Ephesus, and attached themselves to him as companions, were in the hands of the rioters. The trouble among the Christians was great. Paul wished to enter the theatre, and harangue the people. The disciples begged him not to do so. A few of the *asiarchs*,⁴¹ who knew him, also prevailed upon him not to commit such an imprudent act. The most diverse cries were mingled in the theatre. Most of those present were ignorant of the cause of the gathering. There were many Jews, who put forward a certain Alexander.⁴² The latter made a sign with his hand to request silence; but, when they saw that he was a Jew, the confusion redoubled. For two hours they did not cease to cry out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" It was with difficulty that the town-clerk⁴³ succeeded in making himself heard. He represented the honor of the great Diana as safe from any injury; persuaded Demetrius and his artisans to begin a suit against those by whom they believed themselves wronged; begged every one to return to his legitimate occupation; and showed the consequences which might happen to the city from such seditious movements, which could not be justified in the eyes of the Roman authority.⁴⁴ The crowd dispersed. Paul, who had resolved to set out a few days later, did not wish to prolong this perilous situation. He determined to withdraw as soon as possible.

According to the contents of the missive which he had sent by Titus to the Christians of Corinth, Paul should have imme-

diately set out for that city.⁴⁶ But his perplexities were very great. His solicitude with regard to Achaia rendered him undecided. At the last moment, he again changed his itinerary. The time did not seem propitious to him to go to Corinth. He would have arrived there dissatisfied and disposed to harshness.⁴⁶ Perhaps his presence might provoke a revolt and a schism. He did not now what effect his letter had produced, and he was very anxious about it.⁴⁷ He deemed himself stronger in the distance than near by. His person was in no wise imposing; his letters, on the contrary, were his triumph.⁴⁸ Generally speaking, men of a timid disposition prefer writing to speaking. He therefore preferred not to go to Corinth until having seen Titus again; but to write once more to the intractable church. Thinking that severity could be better exercised from the distance, he trusted that his new letter would bring his adversaries to better feelings.⁴⁹ Thus the apostle resumed his first plan of travelling.⁵⁰ He caused the faithful to assemble; took leave of them; gave directions when Titus should arrive to send him to Troas; and set out for Macedonia,⁵¹ accompanied by Timothy. Probably he then associated with himself the two deputies of Ephesus, Tychicus and Trophimus,⁵² commissioned to carry the offering of Asia to Jerusalem. It must have been in the month of June, year 57.⁵³ The sojourn of Paul at Ephesus had lasted three years.⁵⁴

During so long an apostolate, he had had the time to give this church a solidity capable of resisting every shock. Ephesus will henceforth be one of the metropolises of Christianity, and the point where its most important transformations will be effected. This church, however, was far from being Paul's, like the churches of Macedonia and the church of Corinth. Others beside him had worked at Ephesus. He surely had enemies⁵⁵ there; and, in ten years, we shall see the church of Ephesus cited as a model, for having given their due to "those who call themselves apostles, and are not;" for having unmasked their imposture; and for the energetic hatred borne the "Nicolaitanes," —

that is to say, the disciples of Paul.⁵⁶ The Jewish-Christian party doubtless existed at Ephesus from the first day.

Aquila and Priscilla, the collaborators of Paul, continued after his departure to be the centre of the church. Their house, where the apostle had resided, was the gathering-place of all the most pious and most zealous.⁵⁷ Paul took pleasure in praising the merits of this respectable couple everywhere, and acknowledged that he owed his life to them. All Paul's churches, on this account, held them in great veneration. Epénètes, the first Ephesian who was converted, came after them;⁵⁸ then a certain Mary, who appears to have been a deaconess, an active and devoted woman;⁵⁹ then Urbanus, whom Paul calls his "helper";⁶⁰ then Apelles, to whom Paul gives the title of "approved in Christ";⁶¹ then Rufus, "chosen in the Lord," who had an aged mother, called, out of respect, by the apostle, "my mother."⁶² Besides Mary, other women, true sisters of charity, had devoted themselves to the service of the faithful. There were Tryphena and Tryphosa,⁶³ "good laborers in the work of the Lord"; then Persis, especially dear to Paul, and who had labored bravely with him.⁶⁴ There was still Apiphiatus or Amplias,⁶⁵ the Jew Herodion,⁶⁶ Stachys, beloved by Paul; a church or conventicle composed of Asyncritus, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and others;⁶⁷ another church, or little society, composed of Philologus, Julia, Nereus and "his sister" (that is to say, probably, his wife),⁶⁸ Olympas, and several others.⁶⁹ Two large households of Ephesus, those of Aristobulus⁷⁰ and Narcissus,⁷¹ numbered several faithful among their slaves. Finally, two Ephesians, Tychichus⁷² and Trophimus,⁷³ had attached themselves to the apostle, and were henceforth of the number of his disciples. Andronicus and Junia were about this time at Ephesus. They were members of the primitive church of Jerusalem.⁷⁴ St. Paul had the greatest respect for them, "because they were in Christ before him." He calls them "of note among the apostles." In a circumstance of which we are ignorant, probably in the ordeal which Paul calls "his fight with beasts," they shared his prison.⁷⁵

In a much more doubtful light appear Artemus, said to have been Paul's companion,⁷⁶ Alexander the coppersmith, Hymeneus, Philetas,⁷⁷ Phygeleus,⁷⁸ Hermogenes, who appear to have left bad recollections, provoked schisms or excommunications, and to have been considered as traitors in the school of Paul⁷⁹ and Onesiphorus⁸⁰ and his household, who, on the contrary, must have shown themselves, upon more than one occasion, full of friendship and devotion towards the apostle.⁸¹

Several of the names just enumerated are the names of slaves, as may be seen by their strange signification, or from the ironical emphasis, which makes them resemble those grotesque names which they take pleasure in giving negroes in the colonies.⁸² It is not to be doubted that there were many persons of servile condition among the Christians.⁸³ Slavery, in many cases, did not necessitate so complete a bond to the master's house as our modern slavery. Slaves of certain categories were free to visit each other; to associate in a certain measure; to establish brotherhoods, species of tontines and assessments, with consideration to their funerals.⁸⁴ It is not impossible that several of those men and those pious women who devoted themselves to the service of the church, were slaves, and that the hours which they gave to the deaconry were those granted them by their masters. At the period in which these events are taking place, the servile condition contained polished, resigned, virtuous, enlightened, and well-bred people.⁸⁵ The highest lessons of morality came from slaves. Epictetus passed a large portion of his life in slavery. The stoics and the sages, like St. Paul, said to the slave, "Remain what thou art; do not think of freeing thyself."⁸⁶ We must not judge the popular classes of the Greek cities by our populace of the middle ages, — stupid, brutal, boorish, and incapable of distinction. Whatever of fine, delicate, and polished, that we detect in the relations of the primitive Christians,⁸⁷ is a tradition of Greek elegance. The humble artisans of Ephesus, whom St. Paul salutes with so much cordiality, were doubtless agreeable persons, of strict uprightness, distinguished by

excellent manners, and that peculiar charm which exists in the politeness of the lower classes. Their serenity of soul, their contentment,⁸⁸ were like unceasing predication. "See how they love each other!"⁸⁹ was the exclamation of the heathen, surprised at this innocent, tranquil air, this profound and winning gayety.⁹⁰ Next to the preaching of Jesus, this is the divine work of Christianity. It is its second miracle,—a miracle drawn in reality from the active workings of humanity, and from what is best and glorious in it.

CHAPTER XVI.

CONTINUATION OF THE THIRD MISSION.—SECOND SOJOURN OF
PAUL IN MACEDONIA.

UPON leaving Ephesus, Paul probably went by land, at least for a part of the way.¹ In fact, he had calculated that Titus, by going by water from Ephesus to Troas, would reach the latter point before him.² This calculation did not hold true. Having reached Troas he did not find Titus there, a fact which caused him great disappointment. Paul had already passed by way of Troas, but it appears had never preached there.³ This time he found the opportunity very favorable.⁴ Troas was a Latin city of the style of Antioch of Pisidia and Philippi.⁵ A certain Carpus received the apostle, and entertained him.⁶ Paul employed the days during which he was waiting for Titus, to establish a church.⁷ He succeeded admirably; for a few days afterwards a company of the faithful conducted him to the shore when he set out for Macedonia.⁸ About five years ago he had embarked at this same port at the word of a Macedonian man, whom he had seen in a dream. Assuredly no dream ever advised greater things or brought about grander results.

This second sojourn of Paul in Macedonia⁹ may have lasted about six months, from June to November, 57.¹⁰ Paul occupied all this time in strengthening his dear churches. His principal residence was Thessalonica. He must, nevertheless, have also remained some time at Philippi¹¹ and Berea.¹² The tribulations which had filled the last months of his sojourn at Ephesus, seemed to pursue him, at least for the first days after his arrival. He had no repose. His life was a continual struggle; the gravest apprehensions filled his mind.¹³ These cares and these afflictions surely did not come from the churches of Macedonia. There were no churches more perfect, more generous,

more devoted to the apostle. Nowhere had he met with so much affection, nobleness, and simplicity.¹⁴

There were a few bad Christians there, sensual, and attached to the world, in regard to whom the apostle expressed himself with a great deal of sharpness,¹⁵ calling them "enemies of the cross of Christ, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is their shame," and upon whom he calls down eternal destruction ; but it is doubtful whether they even belonged to the flock of Paul. It was from the church of Corinth that proceeded his greatest anxieties. He feared more and more lest his letter should have irritated the indifferent, and encouraged his enemies.

Titus rejoined him at last, and consoled him in all his disappointments.¹⁶ He brought him in the main good news, although the clouds were far from being dissipated. The letter had produced the profoundest effect. Upon reading it, the disciples of Paul had burst out into sobs. Almost all had assured Titus, with tears in their eyes, of the profound affection which they bore the apostle ; of their regret in having afflicted him ; of their desire to see him again, and to obtain pardon from him. These Greek natures, fickle and inconstant, returned to the good with the same readiness that they had abandoned it. There was fear mingled with their feelings. They supposed the apostle to be armed with terrible powers.¹⁷ Before his threats, all those who owed him faith trembled and strove to exculpate themselves. Their indignation against the guilty was boundless. Each one strove by zeal against the latter to justify himself, and to turn away the severity of the apostle.¹⁸ Titus was overwhelmed with the most delicate attentions by the faithful ones of Paul. He returned enchanted with the reception accorded him, — with the fervor, docility, and good-will which he had found in the spiritual family of his master.¹⁹ The collection was not much advanced, but there was hope that it would be fruitful.²⁰ The sentence pronounced against the incestuous one had been made milder ; or rather Satan, to whom Paul had delivered him, did not execute the sentence. The sinner continued to live, and what was but

the simple course of nature they attributed to an indulgence granted by the apostle. They did not even absolutely drive him out of the church, but they avoided associating with him.²¹ Titus had conducted this whole affair with an extreme prudence, and as skillfully as Paul could have done himself.²² The apostle never experienced more unmingled joy than upon receiving these tidings. During several days he was beside himself. At one moment, he repented having grieved such good souls; then, seeing the admirable effect which his severity had produced, he was overwhelmed with joy.²³

This joy, however, was not complete. His enemies were far from yielding. His letter had exasperated them, and they criticised it very strictly. They pointed out those portions severe and harsh towards the church. They accused the apostle of pride and boasting. "His letters," they said, "are severe and energetic, but his person is insignificant, and his word without authority." His rigor towards the incestuous one was attributed to personal hatred. They looked upon him as a foolish and extravagant man, extremely vain, and without tact. The changes in his plans of travelling were represented as fickleness.²⁴ Moved by these two-fold tidings, the apostle began to dictate to Timothy²⁵ a new letter, destined on one hand to soften the effect of the first, and to express to his dear church, which he thought he had grieved, his paternal feelings; on the other, to reply to the adversaries who had, for a moment, almost succeeded in robbing him of the hearts of his children.

In the midst of the numberless disappointments which had assailed him for several months, the faithful ones of Corinth are his consolation and his glory.²⁶ If he changed the plan of his journey, which he had communicated to them by Titus, and which, by taking him twice to Corinth, had permitted him to afford them a double pleasure, it was not through lightness;²⁷ it was out of regard for them, and in order not to show them always a mournful countenance. "For if I make you sorry," adds he, "who is he then that maketh me glad, but the same which is

made sorry by me.”²⁸ He had written them his last letter with tears and broken heart, but now all is forgotten : he hardly remembers that he has been displeased. At times he is repentant, thinking that he has grieved them ; then seeing what fruits of penitence this affliction has produced, he can no longer repent. Sorrow, according to God, is salutary ; sorrow, according to the world, brings death.²⁹ Perhaps also, he was very severe. As regards the incestuous one, for instance, the shame which he had undergone is a sufficient chastisement. They should rather console him, lest he should die of sorrow. Such as he is, he has still claim to charity. The apostle, therefore, confirms most willingly the mitigation of punishment. If he has shown himself so severe, it was only to test the docility of his faithful ones.³⁰ Now he sees well that he had not put too much dependence upon them. Everything favorable which he said to Titus about them has been verified. They were not willing that their apostle, whose glory comes from them alone, should be confounded.³¹

As to his enemies, Paul knows that he has not disarmed them. At each instant there are animated and pointed allusions to those people who “corrupt³² the word of God ;”³³ above all, to those letters of commendation of which a bad use had been made against him.³⁴ His enemies are false apostles, deceitful workers, who transform themselves into apostles of Christ. Satan sometimes transforms himself into an angel of light ; are we to wonder if his ministers transform themselves into ministers of righteousness ? Their end will be according to their works.³⁵ They pretend that he has not known Christ. He does not agree to it ; for him, his vision on the road to Damascus was a real, personal relation with Jesus. But, after all, of what importance is it since Christ is dead,—all are dead with Christ after the flesh. As for him, henceforth, he knows no man after the flesh. If he ever knew Christ in that manner, he knows him no longer.³⁶ They should not oblige him to change his character. When he is among them he is meek, timid, and perplexed, but they should not oblige him to use arms, which have been given him to de

stroy every fortress opposed to Christ, to demolish every height which is raised against the knowledge of God, and to subject every thought to the yoke of Jesus. It will be perceived that he knows how to punish disobedience. Those who say that they are Christ's, should think that he too is of the school of Christ. Would they oblige him to use the powers which the Lord had given him for destruction, instead of edification? They had undertaken to make the Corinthians believe that he sought to terrify them by his letters. Let those who use this language take care lest they force him to be with them in deed such as his letters are in word. He is not of the number of those people who commend themselves and who go about from one place to another with their letters of commendation. His letter of commendation is the church of Corinth. He carries this letter in his heart. It is legible for all: it is not written with ink, but by the spirit of the living God; not upon tablets of stone, but upon the tablets of the heart. He only measures himself by his own measure; he only compares himself to himself. He only arrogates authority over the churches which he has founded. He is not like those people who wish to extend their power over countries where they have not been in person, and who, after having yielded to him (Paul) the gospel of circumcision, come now to gather the fruit of the work which they at first opposed. Each one upon his own ground. He has no need of boasting of the works of others, nor of commending himself beyond measure; the portion which God has bestowed upon him is beautiful enough, since it has been given him to carry the gospel as far as Corinth, and he still hopes to go further. But it is in the Lord that he must glory.³⁷

This modesty was not feigned. But it is difficult for the man of action to be modest; he runs a risk of being taken at his word. That apostle the most free from all egotism is unceasingly led to speak of himself. He may call himself an abortion, the least of saints,³⁸ the last of apostles, unworthy of this name since

he has persecuted the church of God; but do not believe that he on this account abdicates his prerogative.

“But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.”³⁹ . . .

“For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.”⁴⁰

“But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but we have been thoroughly made manifest among you in all things.

“Have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely?

“I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service.

“And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man: for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied: and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself.

“As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia.

“Wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth.

“But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.”⁴¹

Arming himself with the accusation of folly which his adversaries raised against him, he accepts for the moment the character assigned him; and under the mask of oratorical irony he plays the fool, in order to hurl the most daring truths into the faces of his adversaries:⁴²—

“Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me,

“For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise.

“For ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face.

“I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak. Howbeit, whereinsoever any is bold (I speak foolishly) I am bold also.

“Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I.

“Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool,) I am more; in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.

“Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one.

“Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep;

“In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren;

“In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.

“Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.

“Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?

“If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities. . . .

“It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord.⁴³

“Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

“Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses. for Christ's sake, for when I am weak, then am I strong.

“I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me: for

I ought to have been commended of you : for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing.

“Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

“For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive this wrong.

“Behold the third time “ I am ready to come to you ; and I will not be burdensome to you : for I seek not yours, but you : for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children.

“And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you ; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved.

“But be it so, I did not burden you : nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile.

“Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you?

“I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? walked we not in the same steps?

“For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not : lest there be debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults :

“And lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed.

“This is the third time I am coming to you.

“I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time ; and being absent now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that, if I come again, I will not spare :

“Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me,

“Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present

I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me." ⁴⁵

Paul, it will be seen, was entering into that great condition of exaltation in which the religious founders of the first order lived. He regarded his idea as inseparable from himself. The manner in which the collection for the poor of Jerusalem was being carried out afforded him consolation at this moment. Macedonia displayed an exemplary zeal in this respect. Those excellent souls gave with a joy, with an eagerness, which delighted the apostle. Almost all the members of the sect had suffered in their little fortune, from the fact of having adhered to the new doctrine. But their poverty knew how to find an excess for a work commended by the apostle. The hopes of Paul were surpassed. The faithful ones even prayed that Paul should accept the little savings which they had made by force of privations. They would have given themselves, if the apostle would have accepted them. ⁴⁶ Paul, carrying delicacy to an almost exaggerated extent, and wishing, as he said, to be irreproachable not only before God, but before man, ⁴⁷ exacted that deputies should be chosen by election to carry the offering of each church, carefully sealed, ⁴⁸ in order to destroy all suspicions which malevolence might cause to rest upon him, from the fact of handling considerable sums of money. These deputies already followed him everywhere, and formed around him a sort of escort of adjutants always ready to execute his missions. It was these whom he called "envoys of the churches," "the glory of Christ." ⁴⁹ The skillfulness, the suppleness of language, the epistolary talent of Paul, were all employed in this work. In order to recommend it to the Corinthians he made use of the most animated and tender expressions. ⁵⁰ He orders nothing, but knowing their charity, he allows himself to give them advice. It was a year since they commenced ; it was now determined to conclude it ; good-will was not sufficient. It is not a question of putting one's self into straitened circumstances in order to put others in easy ones : the rule in such a case is equality, or

rather reciprocity. For the moment, the Corinthians are rich, and the saints of Jerusalem are poor: it is for the former to assist the latter, the latter will assist the former in their turn. Thus the word will be verified, "He that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack."⁵² Paul entreated the faithful Titus to return to Corinth, and there continue the ministry of charity which he had begun so well. Titus desired this mission, and received it with eagerness.⁵³ The apostle gave him two companions, whose names are unknown to us. One was of the number of the deputies chosen to carry the offering of Macedonia to Jerusalem. "His praise," said Paul, "is in the gospel throughout all the churches." The other was a brother "whom Paul had oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent, upon the great confidence which he had in the church of Corinth."⁵⁴ None of these indications are sufficient to decide who is meant.⁵⁵ Paul entreats the Corinthians to keep the good reputation which he has endeavored to give these three persons concerning them,⁵⁶ and in order to excite their generosity, employ pleasant little tactics which make us smile.

"For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many.

"Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that as I said, ye may be ready:

"Lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting.

"Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness.

"But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully.

“Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give ; not grudgingly, or of necessity ; for God loveth a cheerful giver.”⁵⁶ . . .

“Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food. . . .

“For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God ;

“While by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men ;

“And by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you.

“Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.”

The letter was carried to Corinth by Titus and the two brothers who accompanied him.⁵⁷ Paul still remained several months in Macedonia. The times were very severe. There was scarcely a church which had not to struggle against ever-recurring difficulties.⁵⁸ Patience is the recommendation which the apostle most frequently makes use of. “Afflictions, necessities, distresses, stripes, imprisonments, tumults, watchings, fastings, pureness, long-suffering, kindness, unfeigned love, behold our life ; sometimes honored, sometimes dishonored, sometimes slandered, sometimes praised, taken for deceivers and yet true, for unknown and yet well-known (to God), as dying and behold we live, for people whom God chastens and not killed, as sorrowful yet always rejoicing, as poor yet making many rich, as having nothing and yet possessed of all things.”⁵⁹ Joy, concord, and boundless hope, made the suffering seem light, and inaugurated that delightful reign of the “God of love and peace”⁶⁰ whom Jesus had announced. Through a thousand littlenesses, the spirit of Jesus shed its rays upon these groups of saints with wonderful beauty and mildness.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONTINUATION OF THE THIRD MISSION. — SECOND SOJOURN OF
PAUL AT CORINTH. — THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

PAUL, according to our calculation, set out from Macedonia and went to Greece at the end of November, or commencement of December, in the year 57. He had with him the delegates chosen by the church of Macedonia to accompany him to Jerusalem and carry the alms of the faithful; among others Sopater or Sosipater, son of Pyrrhus of Berea, a certain Lucius, a certain Tertius, Aristarchus, and Secundus of Thessalonica.¹ Jason of Thessalonica, his host upon the occasion of his first journey, accompanied him also, it seems.² In conclusion, perhaps the deputies of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus, of Ephesus, and Gaius of Derbe were already with him.³ Timothy toward this period did not leave him.⁴ All these formed a sort of apostolic caravan of a very imposing aspect. When they had rejoined Titus and the two other brethren who had accompanied the former to Corinth, Corinth truly possessed all the *élite* of the new movement. Paul, conformably to his first plan, which he had several times modified, but which he after all executed in its essential parts, passed the three months of the winter 57-58 in this city (December 57, January and February 58).⁵ The church of Athens was so inconsiderable that Paul, according to all appearances, did not visit it, or at least scarcely stopped there.

The apostle, no longer having at his disposal the pious hospitality of Aquila and Priscilla, lodged this time with Gaius, whose house served for the reunions of the entire church, and to whom a bond, considered then very sacred, attached him.⁶ Stephanas was probably dead or absent. At Corinth he always practiced a great deal of reserve, for he did not feel himself upon a very

sure ground. Seeing the danger presented by mingling in the society of so corrupt a city, he at times returned to his broad principles, and counselled and advised them to entirely avoid relations with the heathen.⁷ The welfare of souls at a given moment was his only precaution, the only design he had in view.

It is probable that the presence of Paul at Corinth entirely calmed the dissensions which for several months back had caused him so much anxiety.⁸ A severe allusion which he makes about this time, "To those who boast of those things which Christ has not wrought by them," and to others "who build upon other men's foundations,"⁹ proves, however, that the deep impression caused by the bad actions of his adversaries still remained. The subscription matter was proceeding in a desirable manner. Macedonia and Achaia had collected a large sum.¹⁰ The apostle finally found a short interval of repose. He profited by it to write, always in the form of an epistle, a sort of summing up of his theological doctrine.¹¹

As this great exposition equally interested all Christendom, Paul addressed it to the majority of the churches which he had founded, and with which he could communicate at that moment.

The churches favored with such communication were at least four in number.¹² One of those churches was the church of Ephesus.¹³ A copy was also sent to Macedonia.¹⁴ Paul even thought of addressing this writing to the church of Rome. In all the copies, the body of the epistle was about the same :¹⁵ the moral recommendation and salutations varied. In the copy intended for the Romans, in particular, Paul introduced several variations befitting the inclinations of this church, which he knew to be strongly attached to Judaism.¹⁶ It is the copy addressed to the church of Rome which served as basis to the arrangement to the context, when the epistles of St. Paul were collected. Hence arises the name borne by the epistle alluded to. The editors (if the expression be allowed) copied the parts in common only once ; but as they would not risk losing anything from the pen of the apostle, they attached to the end of the

princeps copy, the portions which varied in the different copies, or which were completer in one of them.¹⁷

This valuable writing, the basis of Christian theology, is by far the one in which the ideas of Paul are set forth most connectedly. It is there that appears in all its light the great conception of the apostle: The law is nothing; the works are nothing; salvation only comes from Jesus, the Son of God, raised from the dead. Jesus, who, in the eyes of the Jewish-Christian school, is a great prophet come to fulfil the law, is, in the eyes of Paul, a divine apparition rendering useless everything gone before, even the law. Jesus and the law are for Paul two opposite things. Whatever of excellence and efficacy is accorded to the law is a theft committed on Jesus. To abase the law is to exalt Jesus. Greeks, Jews, Barbarians, all are equal. The Jews had been called the first, the Greeks next. All are saved only through faith in Jesus.¹⁸

What can man do, abandoned to himself? One thing only, sin. And at first, as regards the heathen, the spectacle of the visible world, and the natural law written in their hearts, should have sufficed to reveal to them the true God and their duties. Through voluntary and inexcusable blindness, they did not worship God, whom they well knew; they have destroyed themselves through their vain imaginations; their pretended philosophy has been nothing but error. In order to punish them, God has delivered them up to the most shameful vices, — to vices against nature. Nor are the Jews any more innocent. They have received the law, but they have not observed it. Circumcision does not make a Jew. The heathen who observes well the law of nature is better than the Jew who does not observe the law of God. Have not the Jews, then, any prerogative? Without doubt they have. Unto them have the promises been made, — the unbelief of some of them will not prevent these promises from being fulfilled. But the law of itself has not been able to make justice reign. It has only served to create unrighteousness, and to

make it evident. In other words, the Jews, like the Gentiles, have lived under the domination of sin.¹⁹

Whence then comes justification? From faith in Jesus,²⁰ without any distinction of race. All men were sinners; Jesus was a propitiatory victim. His death was the redemption which God has accepted for the sins of the world, the works of the law not having been able to justify the world. God is not only the God of the Jews, he is also the God of the Gentiles. It was through faith that Abraham was justified, since it is written, "He believed, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."²¹ Justification is free, and no one has a right to it from his merits. It is an imputation made by grace, and by an entirely merciful act of the divinity.²²

The fruit of justification is peace with God, hope, and consequently that patience which makes us put our glory and our happiness in tribulations like Christ, who died for the unrighteous, and in whose blood we have been justified. If God loved men so much that he gave his son unto death for them, when they were sinners, what will he not do, now that they are reconciled?²³

Sin and death entered into the world by one man, Adam, in whom all sinned. Grace and salvation entered into the world by one man, Christ, in whom all are justified. Two types of men have existed "the first Adam," or the earthy Adam, origin of all disobedience; "the second Adam," or the heavenly Adam, origin of all righteousness. Humanity is divided between these two file-leaders, some following the earthy Adam, others the spiritual Adam.²⁴ The law has only served to increase the offences, and to give consciousness of them. It is grace, which, existing in superabundance where sin abounded, has blotted out everything; so much so that it can almost be said, that, through the grace of Jesus, sin has been a blessing, and has only served to make the mercy of God apparent.²⁵

But it will be said, let us then sin that grace may be abundant; let us do evil that good may come.²⁶ Behold, said Paul,

what they attribute to me by distorting my doctrine. Nothing is further from my mind. Those who have been baptized in Christ are dead to sin ; buried with Christ, in order to rise again and live with him ; that is to say, to lead an entirely new life. Our "old man," that is to say, the man that we were before baptism, has been crucified with Christ. From the fact that the Christian is freed from the law, it does not therefore follow that he is allowed to sin. From the dominion of sin he has passed to the dominion of righteousness ; from the path of death to the path of life. The Christian, moreover, is death to the law. Now the law created sin. Of itself it was good and holy, but it made sin known, aggravated it,²⁷ and in that manner the commandment, which should have created life, created death. A woman commits adultery, if, while her husband is living, she violates the marriage law ; but after the death of her husband, adultery is no longer possible. Christ, by killing the law, therefore freed us from the law, and joined us to himself. Death to the flesh, which led to sin, death to the law which made us to know sin, the Christian has henceforth only to serve God "in the newness of the spirit and not in the oldness of the letter." The law was spiritual, but man is carnal. There are two natures in man : the one which loves and desires the good ; the other which does the evil, without man being conscious of it. Does it not often happen that we do not the good which we wish, and that we do the evil which we hate ? This is because sin dwells in man, and acts in him without his knowledge. "The inward man," that is to say, reason, adheres to the law of God, but concupiscence is unceasing war with reason and the law of God. "O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord !"²⁸

The true Christian being delivered from the law and from concupiscence, is therefore saved from condemnation by the mercy of God, who has sent his only Son in the likeness of simple flesh to destroy sin, but this deliverance only takes place when man abandons the flesh and lives according to the spirit.

The wisdom of the flesh is a great enemy of God; it is even death. The spirit, on the contrary, is life. Through it we are constituted the children of God. Through it we cry *Abba*, that is to say, "Father."²⁹ But if we are the sons of God, we are also his heirs and the joint heirs of Christ. After having shared his sufferings we shall share his glory. What are all the present sufferings compared to the glory which is soon going to burst upon us? The entire creation is waiting for this great manifestation of the sons of God. It groans; it is, as it were, in the pains of childbirth; but it hopes. It hopes, I say, to be delivered from the slavery in which it groans, subjected as it is to infirmity and corruption, and to pass to the glorious redemption of the sons of God. We also who have received the first fruits of the spirit, we groan within ourselves, awaiting the moment when our elevation to the state of the sons of God shall be accomplished, and our body delivered from its weakness. It is hope which saves us, for we do not hope for what we see. Let us patiently persevere in this waiting for the invisible, with the aid of the spirit. We do not know how to pray, but the spirit aids us in our weakness, and intercedes for us with God in unutterable groanings.³⁰ God, who searches hearts, can divine the desires of the spirit, and interpret these indistinct and inarticulate groanings.³

What a motive for reliance, moreover! It is by a direct act of God—it is of God that we are designated for the metamorphosis which will render us like his Son, and transform all the living ones into a troop of brethren, of whom Jesus will be the eldest. By his foreknowledge, God knows the chosen in advance. Those whom he knows he predestinates; those whom he predestinates he calls; those whom he calls he justifies; those whom he justifies he glorifies. Be content. If for us God has not spared his own Son, and delivered him up to death, what can he refuse us? Who would be on the day of judgment the accuser of the elect? God who has justified them? Who would condemn them? Christ, who died and

rose again, who is seated at the right hand of God, who intercedes for us? Impossible. What can tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, or sword do to us? As for me, adds Paul, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."³²

We see to what a complete rupture with Judaism, Christianity has arrived, in the hands of Paul. Jesus did not go so far. Assuredly, Jesus had loudly proclaimed that the reign of the law was over; that there remained nothing except the worship in spirit and truth of God the Father. But, with Jesus, poetry, sentiment, imagery, and style, are essentially Jewish. He, in a direct line from Isaiah, holds to psalmists, prophets of the time of the captivity, the author of the *Canticle of Canticles*, and at times, the author of *Ecclesiastes*. Paul only holds to Jesus, not such as he was on the borders of the Lake of Gennesaret, but Jesus such as he conceives him, such as he saw him in his vision. For his former co-religionists he has no feeling but pity. The "perfect" Christian, the "enlightened" Christian, is, in his eyes, the one who knows the vanity of the law, its uselessness, and the frivolity of its pious practices.³³ Paul almost wished to be anathema to his brethren in Israel; to him it was a great sorrow, a continual heart-ache, to think of this noble race, elevated so high in glory, which had the privilege of adoption, alliance, law, true religion, and promises, which had the patriarchs, out of whom Christ came after the flesh. But God has not failed in his promises. To be descended from Israel is not to be a true Israelite. One is heir to promises by the choice and calling of God—not through birth. There is nothing unjust in that. Salvation is the result, not of human efforts, but of the mercy of God. God is free to take pity on whom he wishes, and to harden whom he wishes. Who will dare to ask God to account for his preferences? Does the

•

earthen vessel say to the potter, Why hast thou made me thus? Has not the potter the right of the same lump of clay to make two vessels, one unto honor, the other unto dishonor? If it please God to form such a man in order to show his power by destroying him, as he did Pharaoh,³⁴ he has the right to do so; and the more so, as that makes manifest his mercy towards those whom he has prepared and called unto glory. Now this election is made by him without pausing for any consideration, race, or blood.³⁵ If the Jewish people, moreover, have seen themselves supplanted, it is their own fault. They had too much confidence in the works of the law. They thought to attain righteousness through these works. The Gentiles, free from this stumbling-block, entered more easily into the true doctrine — salvation through faith. Israel has sinned by too great a zeal for the law, and, having placed too much dependence upon personal righteousness, which is acquired by the works. This has made them forget that righteousness comes from God alone; which is the fruit of grace, and not of the works. This has made them reject the instrument of this righteousness, which was Jesus.³⁶

Has God then repudiated his people? No. God, it is true, has seen fit to harden and make blind the largest number of the Jews. But the first nucleus of the elect was taken from the bosom of Israel. Besides this, the fall of the Hebrew people is not definitive. The object of this fall is merely to save the Gentiles, and to provoke a salutary emulation between the two branches of the elect. It is fortunate for the Gentiles that the Jews should have for a moment failed in their calling; since it is by their defects, and thanks to their casting away, that the Gentiles have been able to become their substitutes. But, if the casting away of the Jewish people, if a moment's delay on their part has been the salvation of the world, what will be their entry in a body into the church? It will truly be the resurrection. If the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy; if the root be holy, so are the branches. Some branches have been broken

off, and in their place have been grafted the branches of the wild olive, which have thus become partakers of the root and fatness of the olive-tree. Take care, wild olive, not to grow proud at the expense of the branches broken off. It is not thou that bearest the root; it is the root that bears thee. Yes, thou wilt say; but the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Without doubt, they were broken off for lack of faith. Thou, it is to faith that thou owest everything. Take care that thou dost not grow proud. Tremble. If thou dost not persevere, thou also shalt be broken off. If they return to faith, God has the power to engraft them again upon their own trunk. Israel has been made blind until the multitude of the Gentiles has entered the church. But, after that, Israel will be saved in her turn. The gifts of God are without repentance. The friendship of Israel and God has suffered an eclipse, in order that the Gentiles might, in the mean time, receive the Gospel; but the calling of Israel, the promises made to the patriarchs, will not have on this account less effect.³⁷ God makes use of the unbelief of some to save others; then he saves those whom he has rendered unbelieving, in their turn, — all this to establish well the fact that salvation is, on his part, a pure act of mercy, and not a result, to which one may arrive by right of birth, or by the works, or by the free choice of his mind. God takes counsel of no one. He is under obligations to no one. He has no return to make to any one.

“O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out. For of him, and through him, and to him are all things. To whom be glory forever! *Amen.*”³⁸

The apostle, according to his custom, concludes with moral applications. The religion of the Christian is a religion of reason,³⁹ without any other sacrifice than that of one's self. Every one should present to God a victim pure and worthy to be favorably accepted.⁴⁰ The spirit of the church should be modesty, concord, and mutual support. All the gifts, all the

characters, are intimately associated. The same body has several members. All the members have not the same function ; but all have need of each other.⁴¹ Prophets, deacons, teachers, preachers, benefactors, superiors, commissioners for works of mercy, are equally necessary, provided they display, in their functions, that simplicity, zeal, and gayety which these functions demand. Charity without hypocrisy, fraternity, politeness and civilities, activity, fervor, joy, hope, patience, amiability, concord and humility, pardon of wrongs, love of neighbor, eagerness to provide for the wants of the saints, to bless those who persecute you, to rejoice with those who rejoice, weep with those who weep, to overcome evil not with evil, but with good ; such is the morality, in part borrowed from the old Hebrew books,⁴² which Paul preaches, according to Jesus.⁴³ It appears that, at the period when he wrote this epistle, several churches, above all the church of Rome, numbered among their members either disciples of Judas the Gaulonite, who denied the legitimacy of tributes, and preached revolt against the Roman authority ; or Ebionites, who absolutely opposed the reign of Satan and the reign of the Messiah, to one another and identified the present world with the empire of the devil.⁴⁴ Paul replies to them like a true disciple of Jesus :—

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God.

“Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God : and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

“For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power ? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same :

“For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid ; for he beareth not the sword in vain ; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

“Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

“For, for this cause pay ye tribute also : for they are God’s ministers ; ⁴⁵ attending continually upon this very thing.

“Render therefore to all their dues : tribute to whom tribute is due ; custom to whom custom ; fear to whom fear ; honor to whom honor.” ⁴⁶

This was written in the fourth year of Nero. This prince had not yet given any cause to curse him. His government had been, up to this, the best since the death of Augustus. At the moment in which Paul, with a great deal of good sense, was defending tribute against Jewish theocracy, Nero was softening its rigors, and even seeking to apply the most radical reforms to it. ⁴⁷ The Christians of this date had not had cause to complain of him ; and we can conceive that at a period in which the Roman authority was assisting his work instead of opposing it, Paul would seek to warn the tumultuous movements, which might ruin all, and to which the Jews of Rome were much inclined. ⁴⁸ These seditions, and the arrests and punishments which resulted from them, threw the new sect into the greatest disfavor, and caused its adepts to be confounded with robbers and disturbers of the public order. ⁴⁹ Paul had too much tact to be a rioter ; and he desired that the Christian name should be well borne ; that the Christian should be a man of order, to stand well with the police, and enjoy a good reputation in the eyes of the heathen. ⁵⁰ Behold what led him to write this page, equally singular on the part of a Jew and on the part of a Christian. We see here, moreover, a manifestation (with a rare naïveté) of that element of budding Christianity, dangerous for politics. The theory of the divine right of all established power is boldly outlined. Nero has been proclaimed by St. Paul a minister, an officer of God, a representative of divine authority ! The Christian, when he shall be able freely to practice his religion, will be a blind subject, in no wise, a citizen. I do not mean to express any blame here. One never does two things at the same

time, eminently well. It is not only a question of politics ; and it is precisely the glory of Christianity for having created an entire world outside of them. But see to what we expose ourselves with absolute theories ! “The minister of God,” whose approbation all honest men should seek, whose sword is only to be dreaded by the evil-doer, will become, in a few years, the “beast” of the Apocalypse, the “anti-Christ,” the “persecutor of the saints.”

The strange situation of minds, the conviction that the end of the world was approaching, explain, however, this haughty indifference.

“And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep : for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

“The night is far spent, the day is at hand : let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light.

“Let us walk honestly, as in the day ; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying :

“But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.”⁵¹

The struggle of Paul against his adversaries, more or less Ebionitic, occurs in that part of his letter relative to the abstinence from meats and to the observance of neomenies, sabbaths, and days.⁵² The Ebionism, which, from this period, had had its principal centre at Rome,⁵³ adhered strictly to these outward practices,⁵⁴ which were, in truth, only a continuation of those of Essenism. There were scrupulous and ascetic persons, who not only practiced legal ordinances concerning meats, but who also interdicted themselves from eating anything but vegetables, and from drinking wine.⁵⁵ It must be remembered that Christianity recruited itself among the very pious persons, and as such, much given to devotional practices. In becoming Christians, these persons remained faithful to their old customs ;

or rather, the adoption of Christianity was for them only an additional act of devotion (*religio*). Paul, in this new letter, remains faithful to the excellent rules of conduct which he had drawn up for the Corinthians.⁵⁶ Of themselves, these practices are perfectly vain; but the most important point of all is not to shock weak consciences, not to trouble them, not to reason with them. Let him whose conscience is strong not despise him whose conscience is weak. Let the timid conscience not allow itself to judge the sound conscience. Let each one follow his own judgment. That is good which one believes to be good for God. How can one dare to judge his brother? It is Christ who will judge us all. Each one will only have to reply for himself. The distinction of meats is based upon nothing. Everything is pure. But it is important not to scandalize one's own brother. If, by eating lawful meats, thou offendest thy brother, take care. On account of a question of meats, do not ruin a soul for which Christ died. The kingdom of God has nothing to do with eating and drinking: it consists of righteousness, peace, joy, and edification.⁵⁷

The disciples of Paul were occupied several days copying this manifesto, addressed to the different churches. The epistle to the churches of Macedonia was written by Tertius. The Macedonians who accompanied Paul, and the Corinthians who had relations with the churches of the north of Greece, profited by this occasion to salute their brethren.⁵⁸ The epistle to the Ephesians contained the nominal salutation of Paul to almost all the Christians of this great church. As there were very few relations between Corinth and Macedonia upon the one hand, and Ephesus on the other, the apostle does not speak to the Ephesians of those who surround him; but he warmly recommends to them Phebe, deaconess of Cenchrea, who probably carried them a letter. This poor woman set out on a difficult winter voyage across the archipelago, without any other resource than the recommendation of Paul. The church of Ephesus was requested to receive her in a manner worthy of saints, and

to provide for all her needs.⁶⁰ Paul probably had some anxiety concerning the intrigues of the Jewish-Christian party at Ephesus ; for at the end of the letter he adds with his own hand : —

! *“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned ; and avoid them.*

“For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly ; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

“For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad, therefore, on your behalf : but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.

“And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.”⁶⁰

We have seen that St. Paul, in preparing this most important writing, had proposed to send it to the church of Rome. This church had been re-established since the edict of Claudius, and a great deal of good was said about it.⁶¹ It was not numerous,⁶² and in general composed of Ebionites⁶³ and Jewish-Christians.⁶⁴ It also contained, nevertheless, proselytes and converted heathen.⁶⁵ The idea of addressing a dogmatic writing to a church which he had not founded, was an entirely unusual course for Paul.⁶⁶ He greatly feared lest that they should see something indiscreet in his proceedings.⁶⁷ He suppressed everything at all like the tone of a master speaking with authority. He made no personal salutations.⁶⁸ With these precautions he thought that his title, henceforth acknowledged of apostle of the Gentiles,⁶⁹ gave him a right to address a church which he had never seen.⁷⁰ The importance of Rome, as capital of the empire, pre-occupied him. For several years had he entertained the project of going thither.⁷¹ Not being able to execute his design, he wished to give a mark of sympathy to this illustrious church, which contained a class of the faithful, of whom he regarded himself the pastor,⁷² and to announce to them the glad tidings of his future coming.⁷³

The composition and sending of the epistle called "To the Romans," occupied the greatest part of the three winter months that Paul passed this time at Corinth.⁷⁴ These were, in one sense, the best occupied weeks of his life. This writing becomes later, the *resumé* of the Christian doctrine, — the declaration of war of theology to philosophy, — the main writing which led an entire class of austere minds to embrace Christianity as a system of bullying reason, by proclaiming the sublimity and credibility of the absurd. It is the application of the merits of Christ which justifies. It is God who works in us both to will and to do.⁷⁵ This is the overthrow of reason, which, essentially Pelagian, has for its fundamental dogma the liberty and personality of good works. Well, the doctrine of Paul opposed to all human sense, has really been a liberating and salutary one. It has separated Christianity from Judaism, — it has separated Protestantism from Catholicism. The pious observances persuading the devotee that through them he is justified, possess a twofold inexpediency. First of all, they destroy morality, by leading the devotee to believe that there is a sure and convenient way of entering paradise, in spite of God. The most hard-hearted Jew, a wicked and egotistical usurer, imagined that by observing the law, he forced God to save him. The Catholic of the days of Louis XI. thought that by masses, one proceeded against God, as if with a bailiff's summons, so that any such wicked man whom God did not like, might succeed, provided he were wary, in reaching heaven with the game in his hands, and that God would be obliged to admit him into his company. This impiety reached by Judaism through Talmudism, by Christianity through the Catholicism of the middle ages, was met with a most energetic remedy by St. Paul. According to him, we are justified not by works, but by faith. It is faith in Jesus which saves.⁷⁶ This is why this doctrine, apparently so illiberal, was that of all the reformers, the lever by which Wickliff, John Huss, Luther, Calvin, and St. Cyran abolished a secular tradition of routine, an insipid confidence in the priest, and in a sort of outward righteousness, not bringing about a change of heart.

The other objection to the practices is, that they lead to scrupulosity. Being presumed to possess a value of themselves *ex opere operato*, independent of the condition of the soul, they open the way to all the subtleties of a fastidious casuistry. The lawful work becomes a recipe, the success of which depends upon punctual execution. Here again, Talmudism and Catholicism met each other. The despair of the Jewish devotees of the time of Jesus and St. Paul, was the fear of not well observing the law,—the apprehension of not being correct.⁷⁷ It was allowed that the holiest man sins,—that it is impossible not to prevaricate. They were almost led to regret that God had given the law, since it only served to bring about wrong.⁷⁸ They gave utterance to this singular idea, that God must only have established all these ordinances in order to cause sin and make the whole world sinners. Jesus, in the minds of his disciples, came in order to make easy the entrance into this kingdom of God, which the Pharisees had rendered so difficult,—to widen the gate of Judaism which they had made so narrow. Paul, at least, imagines no other mode of suppressing sin than by suppressing the law. His reasoning somewhat resembles that of the probabilists: to increase obligations is to increase offences; to unloosen consciences, to render them as broad as possible, is to prevent offenses, since no one violates a rule by which he does not deem himself restrained.

The great torment of delicate souls is scruple. Whoever consoles them in this respect is all-powerful over them. One of the most ordinary devotional customs of pietistic sects in England, is to regard Jesus as one who inloads the conscience, reassures the sinner, calms the guilty soul, and delivers the mind from evil.⁷⁹ Overwhelmed by the consciousness of sin and condemnation, Paul likewise only finds peace in Jesus. All are sinners; all, even to the last one; all are so on account of their descent from Adam.⁸⁰ Judaism, by its sacrifices for sin, had established the idea of accounts of remission and debts, open in some manner between God and man. Rather a false idea, for sin is

not remitted; it is atoned for. A crime committed will last until the end of time; only, the conscience which committed it may recover itself and perform acts of a contrary nature. The power of remitting sins, was one of those supposed to have been conferred by Jesus upon his disciples. The church had none more precious. To have committed a crime, to have the conscience in torment, was a motive to become a Christian.

“Behold a law which will deliver you from sins from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.”⁸¹ What could be more tempting for the Jew? It is said that one of the reasons which determined Constantine to embrace Christianity was the belief that the Christian alone possessed expiation to tranquillize the soul of a father who had slain his son.⁸² The merciful Jesus, pardoning every one, and even according a sort of preference to those who have sinned, appeared in this troubled world as a great pacifier of souls.⁸³ They professed that it was good to have sinned, that remission was entirely free, that faith alone justified.⁸⁴

A peculiarity of the Semitic language explains such a misconception, and excuses this incomplete moral psychology. The form *hiphil* signifies both effective and declarative at once; so that *hasdik* means equally “to render just” and “to declare just,”—to forgive one a fault which he has committed, and to declare that he has not committed it. The “justified one,” according to this idiom, is not only he who is absolved from a sin, but he who is tranquillized in his own mind, who has nothing more to do with sins which he may have committed, with precepts which he may have violated unconsciously.

When Paul sent this terrible epistle, he had almost fixed upon the day of his departure.⁸⁵ The greatest anxieties beset him.⁸⁶ He had a presentiment of serious accidents, and he often applied to himself these lines of a Psalm:⁸⁷ “For thy sake are we killed all the day long: we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.”⁸⁸ Very exact information, which was but too well verified, represented to him the dangers that he was going to run on account

of the Jews of Judea.⁸⁹ He was not even without fears concerning the disposition of the church of Jerusalem. He had so often found this church influenced by mean prejudices that he feared a bad reception, which, on account of the number of believers still vacillating who accompanied him, would have produced a disastrous effect. He unceasingly invited the faithful to pray God that his offering might be favorably received by the saints.⁹⁰ To put timid provincial neophytes thus into direct contact with the aristocracy of the capital, was a conception of extreme temerity. Guided by his admirable uprightness, Paul was no less persistent in his project. He believed himself bound by an order of the Spirit.⁹¹ He said with emphasis, that he was going to Jerusalem to serve the saints, — represented himself as the deacon of the poor at Jerusalem.⁹² His principal disciples and the deputies, each bearing the offering of his church, were with him, ready to set out. They were, let us bear in mind, Sopater of Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica, Gaius of Derbe, Tychicus and Trophimus of Ephesus, and finally Timothy.⁹³

At the moment in which Paul was going to embark for Syria, the correctness of his fears was confirmed. There was discovered a plot formed by the Jews, to take him, and kill him, during the voyage.⁹⁴ In order to frustrate these plans, Paul unexpectedly changed his itinerary. It was decided that they should go back by way of Macedonia. The departure took place towards the month of April,⁹⁵ in the year 58.

Thus terminated this third mission, which, in Paul's estimation, finished the first portion of his apostolic projects. All the Oriental provinces of the Roman Empire from its extreme eastern limit as far as Illyria,⁹⁶ always excepting Egypt, had heard the gospel announced. Not once had the apostle deviated from his *rôle* of only preaching in countries where Christ had not been yet named, that is to say, where other apostles had not passed. His entire work had been original, and belonged to him alone.⁹⁷ The field of the third mission had included the same

countries as the second. Paul was turning somewhat, in the same circle, and began to find himself hemmed in.⁹⁸ He now longed to accomplish the second part of his projects; that is to say, to announce the name of Jesus in the western world, in order that it might be said that the mystery hidden since the world began was known to all nations.⁹⁹

At Rome he had been outstripped, and moreover, those of the circumcision constituted the majority in the church. It was as the universal pastor of the Gentile churches, in order to strengthen the converted heathen, that he wished to appear in the capital of the empire. He only wished to pass through it; to enjoy for a short time the company of the faithful; to repose and edify himself among them; then take, according to his custom, new travelling companions, who should follow him in his further journeys.¹⁰⁰ Beyond this it was Spain that he had in view.¹⁰¹ At this period Spain had not yet received Israelitish emigrants; ¹⁰² the apostle, therefore, wished this time to deviate from the course which he had until now pursued, of following the trace of synagogues and anterior Jewish establishments. But Spain was considered as the limit of the west, so that Paul believed himself authorized to conclude, from the fact that he had been in Achaia and Macedonia, and that he had reached Illyria, that, when he should have been in Spain, it could truly be said that the name of Jesus had been announced to the confines of the earth, and that the preaching of the gospel was fully accomplished.¹⁰³ We shall see that circumstances, independent of his will, prevented Paul from realizing the second part of the grand plan which he had formed. He was from forty-five to forty-eight years old. He would still certainly have found time and strength to make in the Latin world one or two of those missions which he had conducted in the Greek world with so much good fortune. But the fatal journey to Jerusalem overturned all his plans. Paul felt the perils of this journey, and they were anticipated by all those round him. He could not, nevertheless, renounce a project to which he attached much

importance. Jerusalem was to be the ruin of Paul. It was one of the most unfavorable circumstances for budding Christianity, to have its capital in the midst of such exalted fanaticism. The event which in ten years will utterly destroy the church of Jerusalem, will render Christianity the greatest service it has ever received in the course of its long history. The question of life or death, was to know whether or not the young sect should disengage itself from Judaism. Now, if the saints of Jerusalem grouped around the temple had always remained the aristocracy, or, so to express it, the "Court of Rome" of Christianity, this great rupture would not have taken place; the sect of Jesus, like that of John, would have died out obscurely, and the Christians would have been lost among the sectarian Jews of the first and second century.

CHAPTER XVIII.

RETURN OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM.

PAUL and the deputies of the churches set out from Cenchrea, having with them the contributions of the faithful for the poor of Jerusalem, and directed their course towards Macedonia.¹ It was to some degree the first pilgrimage to the Holy Land, the first voyage of a band of pious converts to the cradle of their faith. It appears that the vessel, during a part of the voyage,³ was freighted at their expense, and obeyed their orders, but it must have been a simple decked boat. They made fifteen or twenty leagues a day. Every evening they stopped to pass the night in the islands or ports with which the coast is filled.² They slept in the inns near the beach. There were often people there, and among their number good-hearted ones, who were near to the kingdom of God. The boat, with its high stern and prow, was drawn up on the sand, or anchored under some shelter. It is not known whether the apostle landed at Thessalonica.

• It is not probable. It would have been a great detour. At Neapolis, Paul wished to go and visit the church of Philippi, which was not far distant. He sent all his companions on ahead, and asked them to wait for him at Troas. He himself went to Philippi,⁴ celebrated the passover there, and spent in repose with those he loved best in the world, the seven days in which they ate the unleavened bread. At Philippi, Paul again met the disciple who upon his second mission had influenced him to go to Macedonia; and who, according to all probabilities, was no other than Luke. He took him with him again, and thus attached to himself a narrator destined to transmit to us the impressions of the voyage with an infinite charm and variety.⁵ When the days of unleavened bread were passed, Paul and Luke re-embarked at Neapolis.⁶ They doubtless had adverse winds, for it took them five days to go from Neapolis to Troas. In

this latter city, the apostolic troupe became entirely complete. There was, as we have already said, a church at Troas. The apostle passed seven days with it, and consoled it greatly. An incident added to the general emotion. The day before the departure was Sunday. In the evening the disciples had united, according to custom, to break bread together. The room in which they were, was one of those high chambers which are so agreeable in the East, — above all, in seaports. The gathering was large and solemn. Paul continued to see everywhere the signs of his coming afflictions.⁷ In his discourse, he reverted unceasingly to his approaching end, and declared to those present that he was bidding them an eternal adieu. It was in the month of May, the window was open, and the room lighted by numerous lamps. Paul spoke the whole evening with an unwearied animation. At midnight he was still speaking, and they had not yet broken bread, when suddenly a cry of horror went up. A young man named Eutychus, seated on the sill of the window, had sunk into a deep sleep, and had just fallen from the third story to the ground. They take him up: they believe him to be dead. Paul, certain of his miraculous powers, does not hesitate to do what Elisha⁸ is said to have done. He throws himself upon the insensible young man, places his own breast upon his breast, his arms upon those of the youth, and soon he announces with confidence that he whom they weep, is still alive. The young man, in fact, had only been bruised by the fall: he was not long in coming to himself. The joy was great, and all believed it to be a miracle. They again ascended into the upper chamber, and when they had broken bread Paul continued talking till the morning.

A few hours after, the vessel set sail. The deputies and the disciples alone went on board. Paul preferred to make the journey from Troas to Assos⁹ (about eight leagues) on foot, or at least by land. Assos was named as rendezvous, where, in fact, they all met again. From this moment Paul and his companions leave each other no more. The first day they went

from Assos to Mitylene,¹⁰ where they went into port ; the second day they followed the strait between Chios and the peninsula of Clazomenes ; the third they touched at Samos,¹¹ but for a reason unknown to us, Paul and his companions preferred to go and pass the night at the anchorage of Trogilium, under the point of the neighboring cape at the foot of Mount Mycale.¹² They thus passed in front of Ephesus without stopping. It was the apostle who desired it. He feared lest the friendship of the faithful of Ephesus should detain him, and that he would not be able to tear himself away from a city which was dear to him ; for he placed great importance upon celebrating Pentecost at Jerusalem, and as twenty-three or twenty-four days had elapsed since the passover, there was no time to be lost. Next day a short sail carried the faithful troop from Trogilium to one of the ports of Miletus.¹³ There Paul experienced a lively remorse for having passed Ephesus without having communicated with his dear community. He sent one of his companions to inform them that he was only a few leagues from them, and to invite the elders or overseers to come to him. They went with eagerness, and, when they were united, Paul addressed them in a feeling discourse, the summing up and last expressions of his apostolic life.¹⁴

“Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons,

“Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews :

“And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house,

“Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

“And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there :

“Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.¹⁵

“But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

“And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.

“Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men.

“For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

“For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

“Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.¹⁶

“Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.

“I have coveted no man’s silver, or gold, or apparel.

“Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.

“I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

Then all knelt and prayed. There was naught heard but a stifled sobbing. Paul’s words, “ye shall see my face no more,” had pierced their hearts. In turn, the elders of Ephesus fell on the apostle’s neck and kissed him. They then accompanied him to the port, and did not leave the shore until the vessel set sail, bearing the apostle far away from this Ægean Sea which

had been as the camp of his struggles, and the theatre of his wonderful activity.

A good fair wind bore the apostolic troop from the port of Miletus to Coos. The next day they reached Rhodes,¹⁷ and the third day Patara,¹⁸ on the coast of Lycia. There they found a ship which was loading for Tyre. The little coasting-vessel, which had until then borne them along the coasts of Asia, would have greatly retarded them had they been obliged to follow the coasts of Pamphylia, Cilicia, Syria, and Phenicia. They preferred to cut their route short, and leaving their first vessel there, they went on board the one which was setting sail for Phenicia. The western coast of Cyprus lay exactly in their course. Paul could see at a distance that Nea-Paphos which he had visited thirteen years before, at the commencement of his apostolic career. He passed this on his left, and, at the end probably of a six or seven days' sail, arrived at Tyre.

Tyre had a church dating from the first missions which survived the death of Stephen.¹⁹ Although Paul had taken no part in its establishment, he was known²⁰ and loved there. In the dispute which divided the young sect,—in this broil between Judaism and the strange child to which Judaism had given birth,—the church of Tyre was decidedly of the party of the future. Paul was very well received, and passed seven days there. All the inspired ones of the place dissuaded him strongly from going to Jerusalem. They affirmed that they had had manifestations of the Spirit absolutely opposed to this plan. But Paul persisted, and chartered a vessel for Ptolemais.²¹ On the day of their departure, all the faithful, with their wives and children, accompanied them out of the city to the shore. The pious assemblage knelt down upon the sand and prayed. Then they bade each other adieu. The apostle and his companions embarked, and the Tyrians returned sorrowful to their homes. The same day they reached Ptolemais. Here also were several of the brethren. They went to salute them, and remained a day with them. Then the apostle journeyed no longer by water.

Skirting Carmel, he reached Cesarea of Palestine in one day. They lodged at the house of Philip, one of the seven primitive deacons, who, for long years, had been established at Cesarea.²² Philip had not assumed, like Paul, the title of apostle, although he had in reality exercised its functions. He had contented himself with the name of "Evangelist," which designated apostle of second rank,²³ and with the still more prized title of "one of the seven."

Here again Paul met with much sympathy. He remained several days with Philip. While he was there, the prophet Agabus arrived from Judea. Paul and he had known each other at Antioch, fourteen years before. Agabus imitated the style of the old prophets,²⁴ and affected to act in a symbolical manner. He enters with a mysterious air, approaches Paul and takes him by the girdle. They follow his movements with curiosity and fear. With the apostle's girdle, which he takes, he binds his own hands and feet, then, suddenly breaking the silence, he said, with an inspired tone, "The Holy Ghost saith this: So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." All hearts were touched. The companions of Paul and the faithful of Cesarea, with one voice, begged Paul to renounce his journey. Paul was inflexible, and declared that he had no fear of chains, since he was ready to die at Jerusalem for the name of Jesus. His disciples saw well that he would not yield, and concluded by saying, "The will of the Lord be done!" They then set about preparing for departure. Several of the faithful of Cesarea joined the caravan. Mnason of Cyprus, a very old disciple, who had a house at Jerusalem, but who was at this moment at Cesarea, was of the number. The apostle and his suite were to lodge with him. They were distrustful of the reception that would be accorded to them by the church. There was much trouble and anxiety in the whole band.

CHAPTER XIX.

LAST SOJOURN OF ST. PAUL AT JERUSALEM. — HIS ARREST.

PAUL entered into this fatal city of Jerusalem for the last time, apparently, a few days after the feast of the Pentecost¹ (July, 58). His suite, composed of delegates from the churches of Greece, Macedonia, and Asia, of his disciples and the faithful of Cesarea, who had desired to accompany him, must have been sufficient to put the Jews on the alert. Paul commenced to be well known. His arrival was expected by the fanatics who had probably received from Corinth and Ephesus the news of his return. Jews and Jewish-Christians appeared to approve of slandering him. They represented him everywhere as an apostate, as the furious enemy of Judaism, as a man who was going about everywhere to destroy the law of Moses and biblical traditions.² His doctrine concerning meats sacrificed to idols, especially, excited great anger.³ They sustained that he disobeyed the articles of the council of Jerusalem, concerning the observances relative to meats and marriage. They represented him as a second Balaam, sowing scandal before the children of Israel, teaching them to practice idolatry, and to fornicate with the heathen.⁴ His doctrine concerning justification through faith and not through works, was energetically rejected.⁵ While admitting that the converted heathen were not bound by the entire law, nothing could free a Jew from duties inherent in his race.⁶ Now Paul paid no attention to this. He assumed the same liberties as his converts. He was no longer a Jew in any respect.

The first brethren whom the new-comers met, on the day of their arrival, received them well.⁷ But it is very remarkable that neither the apostles nor the elders went to meet him, who, accomplishing the boldest oracles of the prophets, brought the nations from distant isles as tributaries of Jerusalem. They awaited his visit with a coldness more politic than Christian, and

Paul must have passed alone, with a few humble brethren, the first evening of his last sojourn in Jerusalem.

James Obliam was, as we have already seen, the sole and absolute chief of the church of Jerusalem. Peter was certainly absent, and very probably established at Antioch. It is presumable that John, according to his custom,⁸ accompanied him. The Jewish-Christian party thus reigned at Jerusalem, without counterpoise. James, blinded by the respect shown him by every one, — proud, moreover, of the bond of relationship which united him to Jesus, represented a principle of preservation and of heavy solemnity, a sort of obstinate papacy, in his narrow mind. Around him a numerous party, more Pharisean than Christian, carried the inclination for legal observances to almost the same degree as the zealots, and imagined that the essence of the new movement was a redoubled devotion.⁹ These exalted ones gave themselves the name of “beggars,” *ebionim* (πτωχοί), and gloried in it.¹⁰ There were several rich ones in the community, but their reputation was bad. They were regarded as haughty, and as tyrannical as the Sadducees.¹¹ Fortune in the Orient has scarcely ever an honest source. It can be said of every rich man, without much chance of being wrong, that either he or one of his ancestors was a conqueror, a thief, extortioner, or sordid¹² man. The connection of ideas which leads one, especially among the English, to associate honor and wealth rather closely, never was the case in the Orient. Judea, at least, had an opposite idea of things. With the saints of Jerusalem “rich” was synonymous with “inimical” and. “wicked”¹³ The ideal of the ungodly was, in their eyes, the wealthy Sadducee who persecuted them, and dragged them before the tribunals.¹⁴ Passing their lives around the temple, they resembled good little brethren occupied in praying for the people. They were, at any rate, downright Jews; and certainly Jesus would have been surprised if he could have seen what his doctrine was becoming in the hands of those who boasted of being nearest to him in spirit and blood.

Paul, accompanied by the deputies of the churches, went to see James the day after his arrival.¹⁵ All the elders were assembled in the house of Obliam. They exchanged the salutation of peace. Paul presented the deputies to James. The former gave him the alms which they had brought. Then he related the great things which God had done in the heathen world, through his ministry. The elders returned thanks to God. Was the reception, however, what could have been expected? Doubtful. The author of the Acts has so completely modified, according to his system of conciliation, the description of the assembly at Jerusalem in 51,¹⁶ that we are justified in believing that he, in his recital, also greatly mitigated the facts under consideration at this moment. In the first case his inaccuracy is proved to us by a comparison with the Epistle to the Galatians. In the second, grave reasons lead us to suppose that he likewise sacrificed the truth to political necessity. At first, the apprehensions indulged in, in advance, by Paul, concerning the disposition with which the saints at Jerusalem will accept his offering,¹⁷ could not have been without some foundation. In the second place, the recital of the author of the Acts contains more than one ambiguous feature. The Jewish-Christians are represented by him as enemies of Paul, almost equal to genuine Jews. These Jewish-Christians had the very worst opinion of him. The elders do not conceal from Paul that the report of his arrival will displease them, and probably provoke a manifestation on their part. The elders do not acknowledge themselves as sharing these prejudices, but they apologize for them. At any rate, it is plain, from their words, that a large portion of the Christians of Jerusalem, far from being ready to receive the apostle well, stood in need of being conciliated and reconciled with him.¹⁸ It is also remarkable that the author of the Acts does not speak of the collection, except late and in the most indirect manner.¹⁹ If the offering was accepted, as it should have been, why does he not say so, when Paul, in three of his epistles,²⁰ devotes whole pages to this

project? It can not be denied that Simon the Magic'an, in most of the cases in which Christian tradition occupies itself with him, is the pseudonym of the apostle Paul.²¹ Could not the recital, according to which this impostor wished to purchase²² apostolic powers with money, be a transformation of the bad reception accorded the collection of Paul by the apostles of Jerusalem? It would be rash to affirm it.²³ Nevertheless, that a college of malevolent teachers should have represented the generous act of a colleague who was opposed to them, as an attempt at corruption, is very admissible. If the elders of Jerusalem were not filled with the most contracted opinions, how can we explain the strange discourse attributed to them by the author of the Acts, and one which betrays all their perplexity? Scarcely had the return of thanks been concluded, than they say to Paul:²⁴—

“Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law.

“And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.

“What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together; for they will hear that thou art come.”²⁵

“Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them;

“Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly and keepest the law.”

Thus these shallow minds can only reply with language of distrust to him who brings them the homage of a world. Paul will be obliged to expiate his prodigious conquests by hypocrisy. He must give pledges to littleness of mind. It is when they shall have seen him with four beggars, too poor to have their

heads shaved at their own expense, fulfil a popular superstition, that they will recognize him as colleague. Such is the strange condition of humanity, that we must not be surprised at such a spectacle. Men are too numerous for it to be possible to establish anything here below, without making concessions to mediocrity. In order to disregard the scruples of the weak, one must be either completely disinterested in the action, or else very powerful. Those whom their position obliges to reckon with the crowd are led to demand singular inconsistencies from great and independent men. Every vigorously asserted thought is an encumbrance in the government of the world. Vindication and proselytism, when they imply a little genius, are suspected things to the conservative parties. Look at those eloquent laymen, who, in our day, have attempted to enlarge catholicism, and to conciliate for it the sympathies of a portion of society, until then closed against religious sentiment,—what have they obtained from the church to which they brought crowds of new adherents? A disavowal. The successors of James Obliam have found it prudent to condemn them, even while profiting by their success. They accepted their offering, without thanks. They said to them, as to Paul, “Brethren, ye see these thousands of old believers, who hold to things which ye pass over in silence; when ye speak to people of the world take care; put aside novelties which scandalize, and sanctify yourselves with us.”

What will Paul do, placed between his great principle of the uselessness of works, and the immense interest which he had in not breaking with the church of Jerusalem? His position must have been painful. Submit to a practice which he considered useless, and almost injurious to Jesus, since it allowed one to believe that salvation is obtained through other things than the merits of Christ, was to place himself in flagrant contradiction with the doctrine that he had everywhere preached, and which, in his great circular epistle, in particular, he had developed with unparalleled force. Why,

moreover, do they ask him to re-establish an antiquated rite, destitute of all efficacy, and almost a denial of the new dogma? To show that he is a Jew, to refute in a peremptory manner the report in circulation that he had ceased to be a Jew, that he no longer acknowledged the law or traditions. Now, most assuredly he did no longer acknowledge them. Was not a connivance at this deception an infidelity towards Christ? All this must have caused Paul to pause, and agitated him most deeply. But a superior principle which guided his life, led him to overcome his repugnances. Paul placed charity above opinions and individual sentiments. Christ delivered us from all law; but if, by profiting by the liberty which Christ has given us, we scandalize his brother, it is better to renounce this liberty, and give one's self up to slavery. It is in virtue of this principle that Paul, as he says himself, became everything to all men,—a Jew with Jews, a Gentile with the Gentiles.²⁶ In accepting the proposition of James and the elders, he made application of his favorite principle. Therefore he submitted. Never, perhaps, in his apostolic life, did he make a greater sacrifice to his work. These heroes of practical life have other duties than the heroes of contemplative life. The first duty of the latter is to sacrifice their activity to their idea,—to say all they think, nothing except what they think, in the exact measure in which they think it. The first duty of the others is, often, to sacrifice their ideas, at times even their most fixed principles, to the interests of the cause which they are seeking to render triumphant.

What they asked of Paul, moreover, was less to make himself a Nazarite,²⁷ than to take upon himself the ordinary expenses of four Nazarites, who had nothing wherewith to pay the sacrifices made upon this kind of occasion. This was a highly esteemed work among the Jews. There were around the temple multitudes of poor people who had made vows, and who were waiting till some rich person should pay for them. "To have a Nazarite shorn" was an act

of piety ; and occasions are quoted in which powerful personages, by way of thanks for a signal favor from heaven, had hundreds of them shaven,²⁸—just about as it was meritorious in the Middle Ages to pay people for making pilgrimages and entering into monastic institutions. Paul, in the midst of the misery which existed in the church of Jerusalem, was considered wealthy. They requested him to perform the act of a rich devotee, and to prove to all, by a notorious proceeding, that he had remained faithful to the practices of his country. James, much given to outward observances, was probably the inspirer of this fantastic idea. They made haste to add, moreover, that such obligations in no wise concerned the converted heathen.²⁹ It was simply a question of not allowing credence to be attached to the frightful scandal that it was possible for a Jew not to practice the law of Moses. So great was the fanaticism inspired by the law, that such a phenomenon would have appeared more extraordinary than the ruin of the world and total overthrow of creation.

Paul, therefore, joined himself to the four beggars. Those who fulfilled such vows began by purifying themselves ; then they entered the temple, remained shut up there a certain number of days, according to the vow which they had made (especially seven and thirty days), abstained from wine, and had their hair shorn. When the number of days was passed, they offered sacrifices which they paid for at rather a high price.³⁰ Paul submitted to everything. The day after his visit to James, he went to the temple and inscribed himself for seven days ; then he performed all the customary rites, —a greater man during these days of humiliation, in which through voluntary weakness he fulfilled an act of antiquated devotion among people in rags, than when he displayed the force and independence of his genius at Corinth or Thessalonica.

Paul had already reached the fifth day of his vow,³¹ when an incident which was but too easy to foresee, decided the remainder of his career, and brought upon him a series of

tribulations, from which, probably, he was only freed through death.

During the seven days which had elapsed since his arrival at Jerusalem, the hatred of the Jews against him was fearfully exasperated. The first or second day of his arrival, he had been seen walking in the city with Trophimus of Ephesus, who was not circumcised. Some Jews from Asia recognized Trophimus, and circulated the report that Paul had introduced him into the temple. This was certainly false ; besides, it would have been exposing one's self to the peril of too certain a death. Doubtless, Paul had not for one moment the thought of letting his Christians take part in the religious practices of the temple. For him, these practices were stricken with sterility. Their continuation was almost an insult to the merits of Christ. But religious hatred satisfies itself at little cost, when there is question of finding a pretext for violence. The populace of Jerusalem was soon persuaded that Paul had committed a crime which could only be washed out in blood. Like all great revolutionists, Paul had reached the impossibility of living. The enmities which he had raised up were going to league together. He was beginning to stand alone. His companions were strangers at Jerusalem. The Christians of that city considered him an enemy, and almost joined hands with the fanatical Jews against him. By attentively analysing certain features of the recital of the Acts,³² by making allowance for the reiterated warnings, which, during the entire return journey, informed Paul of the snares prepared for him at Jerusalem,³³ the question suggests itself, Did not these Jewish-Christians, of whose malevolent dispositions the elders make confession, and on the part of whom the fear of hostile demonstration, contribute to increase the storm which was going to burst upon the apostle? Clement the Roman attributes the ruin of the apostle "to envy."³⁴ This is dreadful to think of, but it is very conformable to the iron law which will rule human affairs until God's day of final triumph. I am wrong, perhaps, but when I read this

twenty-first chapter of the Acts an uncontrollable suspicion arises within me. I do not know what whispers to me that Paul was ruined by these "false brethren," who followed him about the world in order to frustrate his work, and represent him as a second Balaam.

However, it may be the signal for the disturbance came from the Jews of Asia, who had seen him with Trophimus. They recognized him in the temple, where he was fulfilling the ordinances with the Nazarites. "Help! children of Israel!" they cried, "here is a man who everywhere declaims against the Jewish people, against the law, against this holy place. Here is the profaner of the temple, who introduced heathens into the sanctuary." The whole city was soon in commotion. A great crowd assembled. The fanatics seized Paul. Their determination was to kill him; but, to shed blood in the interior of the temple would have been a pollution of the holy place. They therefore dragged Paul out of the temple, and immediately the Levites closed the doors behind him. They then set about killing him. It would have been all over with him if the Roman authority, which alone maintained a shadow of order in this chaos, had not interfered to snatch him out of the hands of the infuriated.

The procurator of Judea, especially since the death of Agrippa I., habitually resided at Cesarea,³⁵ a profane city, ornamented with statue, sinimical to the Jews, and in everything the opposite to Jerusalem.³⁶ In the absence of the procurator, the Roman authority at Jerusalem was represented by the tribune of the cohort, who resided with his entire armed force in the tower of Antonia, at the northwest angle of the temple. The tribune, at this moment, was a certain Lysias, of Greek or Syrian origin, who, by protections purchased with money, had obtained from Claudius the title of Roman citizen, and had from that time added to his name that of Claudius.³⁷ At the news of the uprising, he hastened with several centurions and a detachment by one of the stairways which placed the tower in communication

with the parvises.³⁸ The fanatics then ceased beating Paul. The tribune had him seized and bound with two chains; demanded who he was and what he had done,—but the tumult prevented anything from being heard. The most diverse sounds were mingled. A Jewish uprising was something fearful. These coarse, shrivelled faces, these large eyes bulging out of their orbits, these gnashings of teeth, these vociferations, these people throwing dust in the air, tearing their clothes, pulling them convulsively,³⁹ reminded one of demons. Although the crowd was unarmed, the Romans continued to have a certain fear of men so enraged. Claudius Lysias ordered Paul to be carried into the castle. The excited crowd followed them, uttering cries of death. At the foot of the stairs the throng was so great that the soldiers were obliged to take Paul in their arms and carry him. Claudius Lysias endeavored in vain to calm the fury. A thought without much reflection struck him, or probably was suggested to him by badly informed persons. He imagined that the man whom he had just arrested was the Egyptian Jew, who, a short time before, had led with him into the desert thousands of zealots, announcing to them that he was immediately going to fulfil the kingdom of God.⁴⁰ It was not known what had become of the impostor, and at each uprising they expected to see him reappear among the agitators.

When they had reached the door of the castle, Paul addressed the tribune in Greek, and begged him to let him speak to the people. The latter, surprised that the prisoner should understand Greek, and being certain at least that he was not the Egyptian false prophet, granted him what he asked.⁴¹ Paul then, standing upon the steps of the stairs, made a sign with his hand that he wished to speak. Silence followed, and when they heard him speak Hebrew (that is to say, Syro-Chaldaic), they paid double attention. Paul related, in his usual manner, the history of his conversion and his calling. They soon interrupted him. The cries, "To death!" "To death!" began again. The rage was at its height.

The tribune ordered the prisoner to be brought into the castle. He understood nothing about this affair. Like a brutal and stupid soldier, his idea was to examine him who was the cause of all the trouble, in order to clear it up. They seized Paul, and had already stretched him up at the stake in order to receive the lashes, when he declared to the centurion who was directing the torture, that he was a Roman citizen.⁴² The effect of this announcement was very great. The executioner turned aside. The centurion went to refer it to the tribune. The tribune was much surprised. Paul looked like a poor Jew. "Is it true thou art a Roman citizen?" asked Claudius of him. "Yes." "But I have expended a considerable sum to obtain this title." "And I have it by birth," replied Paul. The stupid Claudius commenced to fear. His poor brain was torturing itself to discover the truth of this affair. The outrages against the rights of Roman citizens were prosecuted in a very severe manner. The sole fact of having bound Paul to a post, with a view to scourging him, was a crime.⁴³ The violence⁴⁴ which would not have been heard of, had there only been question of an obscure man, might now assume disagreeable proportions. Finally, Claudius conceived the idea of convoking the chief priest and the council on the morrow, in order to know what grievance they charged against Paul, for, as for himself, he saw none.⁴⁵ The high priest was Ananias, the son of Nebedee,⁴⁶ who, by a rare exception, had held this high position for ten years.⁴⁷ He was a man much thought of, in spite of his gormandizing, which remained proverbial among the Jews.⁴⁸ Independent of his office, he was one of the chiefs of the nation.⁴⁹ He belonged to that family of Hanan,⁵⁰ which one was sure to find upon the judge's bench whenever there was question of condemning Christians, popular saints, and innovators of all kinds. Ananias presided at the assembly. Claudius Lysias ordered Paul to be freed from his chains. Then he had him brought in. He himself was present at the discussions. They were very tumultuous. Ananias flew into a passion, and for an expression which

appeared blasphemous to him, ordered his assistants to smite Paul on the mouth. "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall," replied Paul. "Thou pretendest to judge me according to the law, and thou commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law." "What! revilest thou God's high priest?" said the assistants. Paul, bethinking himself, replied, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest; for it is written, 'Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.'"⁵¹ This moderation was skillfully calculated. In fact, Paul had remarked that the assembly was divided into two parties, animated in regard to him with entirely different sentiments. The high Sadducean clergy was absolutely hostile to him, but he might agree to a certain point with the Pharisean *bourgeoisie*.⁵² "Brethren," cried he, "I am a Pharisee. Know ye why I am accused? For my hope in the resurrection of the dead." This was touching a sore spot. The Sadducees denied the resurrection, and the existence of angels and spirits: the Pharisees admitted everything.⁵³ Paul's stratagem succeeded admirably.⁵⁴ There was soon a dissension in the assembly. The Pharisees and Sadducees were more eager to combat each other than to destroy their common enemy. Several Pharisees even undertook the defence of Paul, and pretended to find the recital of his vision no wise improbable. "We find no evil in this man," said they. "Who knows if an angel or spirit hath not spoken to him?"

Claudius Lysias listened to this debate with his mouth open. It was incomprehensible to him. Seeing the moment arrive, when, like the day before, Paul was on the point of being torn to pieces, he ordered a squad of soldiers to enter the room, take Paul out of their hands, and lead him back to the castle. Lysias was much perplexed. Paul, however, rejoiced at the glorious testimony which he had just given of Christ. The night following he had a vision. Jesus appeared to him, and said, "Be of good cheer, Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome."

The hatred of the fanatics did not slumber during this time.

A certain number of these zealots, or assassins, always armed with a dagger for the defence of the law, entered into a conspiracy to kill Paul. They bound themselves by an oath, under the most terrible anathemas, not to eat or drink while Paul should be alive.⁵⁵ There were more than forty of the conspirators. They took their oath on the morning of the day which followed the meeting of the council. To attain their ends, they went, it is said, to the priests, informed them of their plan, and engaged them to intercede with the tribune, through the council, in order to obtain a new hearing of Paul on the morrow. The conspirators were to seize the opportunity, and kill Paul upon his appearance. But the secret of the plot was ill-kept. It became known to the nephew of Paul, who resided in Jerusalem. The former hastens to the barracks, and reveals everything to Paul. Paul has him conducted to Claudius Lysias by a centurion. The tribune takes the young messenger by the hand, leads him on one side, obtains from him all the details of the plot, and dismisses him with directions to say nothing. From this moment, Claudius Lysias hesitated no longer. He resolved to send Paul to Cesarea, in order, on the one hand, to remove every pretext of disturbance at Jerusalem; and on the other, to shift this difficult matter upon the shoulders of the procurator. Two centurions received the order to prepare an escort capable of resisting attempts at abduction. The escort was composed of two hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two hundred of those guards⁵⁶ who served as what were called *custodia militaris*; that is to say, for guarding prisoners bound to them by means of a chain passing from the right hand of the captive to the left hand of his keeper. Beasts for Paul were also ordered, and the whole was to be ready at the third hour of the night (nine o'clock in the evening). At the same time, Claudius Lysias wrote an *elogium* to the procurator Felix; that is to say, a letter, in which he informed him of the matter, declaring that for his part he saw nothing in it, excepting trifling questions of religion; nothing which might call for either death or imprisonment; and

further, that he had charged the accusers that they would also be obliged to present themselves before the procurator.

These orders were punctually executed. They made a forced march by night. By morning they reached Antipatris,⁵⁷ which is more than half way between Jerusalem and Cesarea.⁵⁸ There, all danger of surprise having disappeared, the escort divided. The four hundred infantry, after a halt, set out for Jerusalem. The detachment of cavalry alone accompanied Paul to Cesarea. Thus the apostle re-entered (commencement of August, 58) as a prisoner, the city which he had left twelve days before,⁵⁹ in spite of the sinister warnings which his customary boldness prevented him from heeding. His disciples rejoined him shortly afterward.⁶⁰

CHAPTER XX.

CAPTIVITY OF PAUL AT CESAREA OF PALESTINE.

FELIX was then ruling over Judea, with the power of a king and the soul of a slave.¹ He was the freedman of Claudius, and brother of that Pallas who had made the fortune of Agrippina and that of Nero. He had all the immorality of his brother, but not his administrative talents. Appointed, through the influence of Pallas, procurator of Judea in 52, he there showed himself cruel, debauched, and avaricious.² Nothing was above his ambition. He was successively married to three queens,³ and allied by marriage to the Emperor Claudius.⁴ At the period now reached, his wife was Drusilla, sister of Herod Agrippa II., whom he had taken away from her first husband, Aziz, king of Emessa, by infamous proceedings.⁵ There was no crime of which he was not deemed capable. They even went so far as to accuse him of practicing brigandage for his own benefit,⁶ and of making use of the assassin's dagger to gratify his hatred.⁷ Such were the men upon whom the highest functions had devolved, since Claudius had given up everything to freedmen. There were no more Roman knights, or grave functionaries, like Pilate or Caponius. They were covetous valets, haughty and dissolute, profiting by the political abjection of this poor old Oriental world, to gorge themselves at their ease, and wallow in the mire.⁸ Something so horrible and so shameful had not as yet been seen.

The chief of the squadron who had brought Paul, upon his arrival gave up the *clogium* and the prisoner to Felix. Paul appeared for a moment before the procurator, who inquired of what country he was. The *clogium* assigned a privileged position to the accused.⁹ Felix said that he would hear the cause upon the arrival of the accusers. In the mean time, he

ordered Paul to be kept, not in prison, but in the old palace of Herod the Great, which had now become the residence of the procurators. At this juncture Paul was doubtless intrusted to a soldier (*frumentarius*), who was charged, upon his life, to keep him, and produce him upon every requisition.¹⁰

At the end of three days¹¹ the Jewish accusers arrived. The high priest Ananias had come in person, accompanied by several elders. Knowing how to speak Greek and Latin, and full of confidence in the official rhetoric of the period, they had associated with themselves a certain Tertullus, a lawyer. The audience took place immediately. Tertullus, according to the rules of his profession, began with the *captatio benevolentiae*. He eulogized the government of Felix with assurance; spoke of the happiness enjoyed under his administration, of the public gratitude, and entreated him to listen with his usual kindness. Then he entered upon his subject, qualified Paul as a pest, a disturber of Judaism, a chief of the heresy of the Nazarenes, an intermeddler, solely occupied in exciting seditions among his co-religionists throughout the entire world. He dwelt upon the pretended violation of the temple, which constituted a capital crime, and sustained that, by seeking to get possession of Paul, they had only wished to judge him conformably to the law.

Upon a sign from Felix, Paul then began to speak. He sustained that his conduct in the temple had been that of a most peaceable Jew; that he had neither disputed there nor caused any riot; that he had never preached in Jerusalem; that he was in truth a heretic, if being a heretic was to believe in everything written in the law and the prophets, and to hope for the resurrection of the dead; that, at the bottom, the only crime of which he was accused was believing in the resurrection. "But," added he, "the Jews themselves believe in it."

In regard to the Jews, this was a skillful apology—even more skillful than sincere—since, dissimulating the true difficulty, it sought to give to understand that they could agree when they did not agree, and avoided the question in a manner since then

often imitated by Christian apologists. At any rate, Felix, who took little interest in the dogma of the resurrection, must have remained indifferent. He closed the sitting abruptly, declaring that he would not pronounce his decision until after a fuller investigation, and an interview with Claudius Lysias. In the mean time, he ordered the centurion to treat Paul kindly, that is to say, to leave him unbound in the state of *custodia libera*,¹² and to allow his disciples, as well as his friends, to have access, and to minister unto him.

A few days after, Felix and Paul saw each other again. Drusilla, who was a Jewess, desired, it is said, to hear the apostle set forth the Christian faith. Paul spoke of righteousness, continence, and of the judgment to come. All this but ill suited this new kind of catechumen. Even Felix, as it appears, was frightened. "Go thy way, for this time," said he to Paul; "when I have a convenient season I will call for thee." Having learned that Paul had brought considerable sums with him, he hoped to receive, from him or his friends, a large amount for his deliverance. It appears that he saw him several times, and strove to suggest this idea to him. But the apostle not lending himself to the purpose, Felix desired at least to obtain through this affair some gain for his much-weakened popularity. The greatest pleasure that they could have afforded the Jews was to persecute those whom they regarded as their enemies. He therefore kept Paul in prison, and even had him chained again.¹³ Thus Paul passed two years.

Imprisonment, even with the addition of the chains and the guard, was far from being then what it is now, a total loss of liberty. Especially, when one had pecuniary resources, was it easily possible to make arrangement with the guard, and thus devote one's self to business. At any rate, one could see his friends, one was not secreted, nor any check put upon his activity.¹⁴ It is not at all doubtful, therefore, that Paul, although a prisoner, continued his apostolate at Cesarea. Never did he have so many of his disciples with him. Timothy, Luke, Aris

tarchus of Thessalonica, Tychicus, and Trophimus, bore his orders in all directions, and were of service in the correspondence which he kept up with his churches. In particular, he commissioned Tychicus and Trophimus with a mission for Ephesus.¹⁵ Trophimus, it appears, fell sick at Miletus.¹⁶

In consequence of the sojourn they then made in Palestine, the most intelligent members of the churches of Macedonia and Asia found themselves in prolonged connection with the churches of Judea. Luke, in particular, who, until then, had not left his in Macedonia, was initiated into the traditions of Jerusalem. Doubtless he was vividly impressed with the Hierosolymitic majesty, and imagined the possibility of a reconciliation between the principles sustained on the one hand by Paul, and on the other by the elders of Jerusalem. He thought that it was best to forget reciprocal wrongs, to prudently throw a veil over these wrongs, and to say nothing more about them. The fundamental ideas which were to preside over the preparation of his great writings were, probably, even then fixed in his mind. By these divers contacts a uniform tradition was establishing itself. The Gospels were being elaborated by an intimate communication between all the parties constituting the church. Jesus had created the church. The church, in turn, was creating him. That grand ideal, destined for centuries to sway humanity, was issuing in reality from humanity's very vitals, and from a sort of secret concert among all those to whom Jesus had bequeathed his spirit.

Felix finally succumbed, not under the indignation which his crimes should have produced, but under the difficulties of a situation, against which no procurator had been able to contend. The life of a Roman governor at Cesarea had become insupportable. Jews and Syrians, or Greeks, were unceasingly struggling with each other. The most upright man would not have known how to hold the balance between such fierce hatreds. The Jews, according to their custom, made complaint in Rome. They had quite strong influences at their command there;

especially through Poppœa,¹⁷ and the intrigues directed there by Herod Agrippa II. Pallas had lost a great deal of his credit, especially since the year 55.¹⁸ He could not prevent the disgrace of his brother. He only succeeded in saving him from death. They sent a successor to Felix, an inflexible and just man,¹⁹ Porcius Festus, who arrived at Cesarea in the month of August, in the year 60.²⁰

Three days after his arrival he went to Jerusalem. The high priest Ishmael, the son of Phabi, and the entire Sadducean party, that is to say, the high priesthood,²¹ surrounded him, and one of the first demands addressed him was in relation to Paul. They wished to have him brought back to Jerusalem. They would have arranged an ambuscade to kill him on the road. Festus replied, that he was soon going to set out for Cesarea, and it was consequently preferable that Paul should remain there. But, as the Romans never pronounced judgment without confronting the accused and his accusers, it would be necessary that those of the chiefs who wished to accuse Paul should go with him. At the end of eight or ten days he returned to Cesarea, and the day after, summoned Paul and his adversaries before his judgment-seat. After a stormy debate, Paul sustaining that he had done nothing either against the laws, or against the temple, or against the emperor, Festus proposed to him to have him conducted back to Jerusalem, where he might, under his control and high jurisdiction, defend himself before a Jewish court. Festus was doubtless ignorant of the project of the conspirators. He thought, by this dismissal, to rid himself of a troublesome case, and to do an agreeable thing to the Jews, who demanded the transfer of the prisoner with so much urgency.

But Paul took good care not to accept. He was possessed with a desire to see Rome. The capital of the world had for him a sort of powerful and mysterious charm.²² He maintained his right to be judged before a Roman tribunal, protesting that no one had the power to deliver him up to the Jews, and pro-

nounced the solemn sentence, "I appeal unto Cæsar." These words, uttered by a Roman citizen, had strength to overcome all provincial jurisdictions. The citizen, in whatever part of the world he might be, had the right of having himself conducted to Rome for trial. The governors of provinces, moreover, frequently sent cases of religious right to the emperor and his council.²³ Festus, surprised at first by this appeal, consulted with his assistants for a moment, then replied by the formula, "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar, unto Cæsar shalt thou go."

The sending of Paul to Rome was from that moment decided upon, and they only awaited an opportunity to have him set out. A singular incident occurred in the mean time. A few days after the return of Festus to Cesarea, Herod Agrippa II. and his sister Berenice, who lived with him, not without the existence of infamous suppositions,²⁴ arrived to salute the new procurator. They remained several days at Cesarea. In the course of the conversation which they had with the Roman functionary, the latter spoke to them about the prisoner left by Felix. "His accusers," said he, "have charged him with no such crimes as I expected to see proven. There is only question, in this entire affair, of subtleties relative to their superstitions, and to a certain Jesus, who is dead, and whom Paul affirms to be living." "Quite right," said Agrippa. "I have desired to hear this man for a long while." "Thou shalt hear him to-morrow," replied Festus.

On the morrow, in truth, Agrippa and Berenice went to the tribunal with a brilliant suite. All the officers of the army and the principal men in the city were present. No official procedure could take place after an appeal to the emperor. But Festus declared, according to his views, the sending of a prisoner to Rome should be accompanied with a report. He feigned to be desirous of gaining information for the report which he had to make in this matter; alleged his ignorance of Jewish affairs, and declared himself willing to follow the advice of King Agrippa in this case. Agrippa invited Paul to speak. Paul

then delivered, with a certain oratorical complaisance, one of those discourses which he had repeated a hundred times. He deemed himself happy to have to plead his cause before a judge so learned in Jewish questions as was Agrippa. He entrenched himself more than ever within his ordinary system of defence ; pretended to say nothing which was not in the law and the prophets ; sustained that they were prosecuting him solely on account of faith in the resurrection, — a faith which is that of all the Israelites ; which gives a motive to their piety, a foundation to their hopes. He explained by quotations from the Scripture his favorite theses, namely, that Christ was to suffer and to be the first to rise from the dead.²⁵ Festus, unacquainted with all these speculations, took Paul for a visionary, a learned man of his kind, but misguided and fanatical. “Thou art beside thyself, Paul,” said he to him. “Thy learning hath made thee mad.” Paul invoked the testimony of Agrippa, as better versed in Jewish theology, knowing the prophets, and, as he supposed, acquainted with the facts relating to Jesus. Agrippa replied in an evasive manner. Apparently a bit of pleasantry was mingled with the conversation. “Thou almost persuadest me to be a Christian,” said Agrippa. Paul, with his ordinary readiness, adapted himself to the calibre of his hearers, and concluded by wishing that all might resemble himself, “except these bonds,” added he, with a slight irony. The effect of this courteous assembly, so different from audiences in which the Jews figure as accusers, was, in the main, favorable to Paul. Festus, with his Roman good sense, declared that this man had done nothing evil. Agrippa was of the opinion that he might have been set at liberty, had he not appealed to the emperor. Paul, who wished to go to Rome, conducted by the Romans themselves, did not withdraw his appeal. They therefore placed him, together with several other prisoners, under the guard of a centurion of the cohort *prima Augusta Italica*,²⁶ named Julius, who must have been an Italian. Timothy, Luke, and Aristarchus of Thessalonica, were the only ones of his disciples who took passage with him.²⁷

CHAPTER XXI.

VOYAGE OF THE CAPTIVE PAUL.

THEY embarked upon a ship of Adramytium of Mysia, which was on its return voyage. In one of the intermediate ports, Julius expected to meet with a vessel setting out for Italy, and take passage in it. It was about the time of the autumn equinox.¹ They had a rough sail in prospective.² Upon the second day they reached Sidon. Julius, who treated Paul with a great deal of kindness, allowed him to enter the city, to visit his friends, and receive their attentions. Their course would have been to take the main and reach the southwest point of Asia Minor, but the winds were adverse. They were obliged to sail northward, coasting Phenicia, hugging the shores of Cyprus, and leaving it on the larboard. They followed the channel between Cyprus and Cilicia, crossed the Gulf of Pamphylia, and reached the port of Myra,³ in Lycia. There they abandoned the Adramytium ship. Julius having found an Alexandrine vessel which was setting sail for Italy, made a bargain with the captain, and transferred his prisoners on board. The vessel was heavy laden, having two hundred and seventy-six persons.⁴

The voyage now becomes a most arduous one. After several days they were not yet off Cnidus. The captain wished to enter the port, but the wind coming from the northeast did not allow it, and they were obliged to be borne towards the isle of Crete. They soon sighted the Cape of Salome,⁵ which is the eastern point of the island. The island of Crete forms, as it were, an immense barrier, which transforms that portion of the Mediterranean which it covers on the south, into a sort of large port, sheltered from tempests coming from the Archipelago. The captain was very naturally led to profit by this advantage. He therefore followed the eastern coast of the isle, not without great perils; then putting the island to the windward of him, he

entered into the calm waters of the south. They found there a small harbor, quite deep, shut in by a little island, and bordered by sandy beaches, between which a rocky point advances, so that it seems divided into two parts.⁶ It is what they called *Kali Limenes* (The Good Havens). Near there was a city named Lasea or Alassa.⁷ They took refuge in this harbor. The crew and the vessel had suffered greatly, and they made quite a long stay in this little port.

When it was proposed to set sail, the season was much advanced. The great fast of the atonement (*Kippour*) in the month *Tishri* (October) was passed. The Jews considered this fast the limit of the term beyond which voyages were not safe.⁸ Paul, who had acquired some authority over the vessel, and who, moreover, had long been accustomed to the sea, gave his advice. He predicted great dangers if they should re-embark. "But the centurion (we can not be so much surprised at this as the narrator of the Acts) had more confidence in the words of the captain and the supercargo, than in those spoken by Paul." The port of *Kali Limenes* was not favorable to winter in. The general advice was that they should endeavor to reach, in order to pass the bad months, the port of Phenice situated on the southern coast of the island,⁹ where those who were acquainted with these regions promised that good anchorage would be found. One day while a southern breeze was blowing, they deemed it a favorable moment. They raised anchor; they tacked along the coast of the island as far as Cape Littinos; then they ran before the wind towards Phenice.

The crew and the passengers believed themselves at the end of their troubles, when, all at once, one of those sudden hurricanes from the east, which the sailors of the Mediterranean call the Euroclydon,¹⁰ burst upon the island. The vessel was soon rendered unfit to bear up against the storm. They let her scud before the wind. They passed near a little island named Claudia.¹¹ They placed themselves for a moment under the shelter of this island, and profited by the short respite thus ob-

tained, to draw up, with great difficulty, the ship's boat, which every moment was threatening to go to pieces. Then they took precautions, in view of a shipwreck, which all considered inevitable. They bound the hull of the vessel with cables.¹² They furled the sails, and abandoned themselves to the wind. The second day the tempest was still as strong. They wished to lighten the ship. They threw overboard the entire cargo. The third day they cast out the furniture and utensils which were not necessary for working the ship. The following days were frightful. The sun was not visible for a moment; not a single star was to be seen; they knew not whither they were drifting. Elsewhere filled with islands, the Mediterranean between Sicily and Malta on the west, the Peloponnesus and Crete on the east, southern Italy and Epirus on the north, and the coast of Africa on the south, presents a large square of open sea, in which the winds unchain themselves without obstacle, and roll up enormous masses of water. This is what the ancients frequently called the Adriatic.¹³ The general opinion of the people on board was, that the vessel was running into the Syrtes of Africa, in which the loss of life and goods was certain. All hope fled. No one thought of taking food; it would have been, moreover, impossible to prepare it. Paul alone remained calm. He was convinced that he would see Rome, and that he would appear before the tribunal of the emperor. He encouraged the crew and the passengers. He even said, it appears, that it had been revealed to him, in a vision, that no one would perish; God having accorded him the lives of all, in spite of the wrongs they had done in leaving the Good Havens contrary to his advice.

The fourteenth night, however, after leaving this port, towards midnight, the sailors imagined that they saw land. They cast the lead, and find twenty fathoms; shortly after, they find fifteen fathoms. They feared that they were going to strike upon reefs. Immediately they cast four anchors from the stern;¹⁴ they make fast the rudders, that is to say, the two large paddles which project from either side of the hind-castle.¹⁵ The vessel stops; they

await daylight with anxiety. Then the sailors, profiting by their skill as seamen, wished to save themselves at the expense of the passengers. Under pretext of casting the forward anchors they set the boat afloat, and undertook to enter it. But the centurion and the soldiers, being warned, it is said, by Paul,¹⁶ of this treacherous conduct, made opposition. The soldiers cut the ropes which held the boat, and cast her off. Paul, nevertheless, spoke kindly to all, and assured them that no one would be harmed. During these crises of seafaring life, existence, as it were, ceases. When they are past, one discovers that he is dirty and hungry. For fourteen days scarcely any one had taken food, either from excitement or sea-sickness. Paul, while awaiting daylight, counselled all to eat, in order to acquire strength for the manoeuvring which remained to be done. He set the example himself; and, like a pious Jew, broke bread according to custom, after he returned thanks, in presence of them all. The passengers followed his example, and were of better cheer. They lightened the vessel still more, by throwing overboard all the wheat that remained.

Finally day broke, and land was visible. It was uninhabited; no one recognized the country they had reached. There was a bay before them, having a sandy beach. They determined to run upon the shore; the wind blew in that direction. They cut the cables from the anchors, which they left in the sea, they loosened the rudder-bands, they hoisted the mainsail,¹⁷ adjusted it to the wind, and steered towards the beach. The ship struck upon a strip of land washed on both sides by the sea, and remained there. The prow sank into the sand, and was immovable. The stern, on the contrary, beaten by the waves, was weakened and disjointed by every blow. Salvages, under these conditions, are very easy on the coasts of the Mediterranean, because the tide is inconsiderable. A wrecked vessel answers for a shelter, and it is easy to establish means of communication. But the fact that many of the passengers were prisoners aggravated the situation. They might swim away and escape from their guar-

dians. The soldiers proposed to kill them. The upright Julius rejected this barbarous idea. He ordered those who knew how to swim, to throw themselves the first into the water and reach the land, in order to assist in saving the others. Those who did not know how to swim, escaped on boards and pieces of the wreck. No one was lost.

They soon learned that they were on the island of Malta.¹³ The island, long since under Roman rule, and already strongly Latinized, was rich and prosperous.¹⁹ The inhabitants shewed themselves kind, and kindled a large fire for the unfortunate castaways. The latter, in truth, were benumbed with cold, and the rain continued to fall in torrents. A very simple incident, exaggerated in the imaginations of Paul's disciples, then occurred.²⁰ In taking up a handful of brush-wood, in order to throw it into the fire, Paul at the same time picked up a viper. It was thought to have bitten him in the hand. The idea spread that this man was a murderer followed by Nemesis, who, not being able to reach him by means of the tempest, was pursuing him on land. The people of the country, it appears, expected every instant to see him swell and fall dead. As nothing of the kind took place, they looked upon him as a God.

Near the bay in which the vessel was wrecked, were the lands of a certain Publius, *princeps* of the municipium formed by the island, together with Gaulos.²¹ This man went to those wrecked, and received them into his manor, at least a part of them, of whom were Paul and his companions, and for three days entertained them with a great deal of hospitality. Here again happened one of those miracles which the disciples of Paul imagined they saw open every instant under his feet. The apostle cured, it is said, by laying on of hands, the father of Publius, who was suffering from a fever and dysentery. His reputation as thaumaturgist spread through the island, and they brought him the sick from all sides. It is not said, however, that he established a church here. These low African popula-

tions²² could not raise themselves above superstition and gross sensualism.

The ancient coasting-vessels of the Mediterranean were accustomed to lay up during the winter. The frightful voyage which they had just made did not encourage them to set out again. They remained three months at Malta, from the 15th of November, 60, to the 15th of February, 61, very nearly. Then Julius negotiated for the passage of his prisoners and soldiers upon another Alexandrine vessel, the *Castor et Pollux*, which had wintered in the haven of the island. They reached Syracuse, where they remained three days; then they sailed towards the strait, and touched at Rhegium. The next day a good south wind arose, and carried the vessel in two days to Puteoli.

Puteoli, as we have already said, was that port of Italy most frequented by the Jews. It was there, in general, that the ships from Alexandria discharged their cargoes.²³ There had been formed here, at the same time as at Rome, a petty Christian society. The apostle was well received here. They entreated him to remain seven days; and thanks to the kindness of the good Julius, who had become strongly attached to him, this was possible. They then set out for Rome. The report of Paul's arrival had spread among the faithful of that city, to some of whom, he was already, since the sending of his epistle, a known and respected master. At the relay-house, called the Forum of Appius,²⁴ forty-three miles from Rome, on the Appian road, the first deputation reached him. Ten miles further on, at the end of the Pontine Marshes, near a place called the "The Three Taverns," on account of the inns established there,²⁵ a new group joined him. The joy of the apostle burst out in earnest expressions of thanks. The holy band made, not without emotion, the eleven or twelve leagues which separated the Three Taverns from the Campagna gate, and still following the Appian road, by way of Aricia and Albano, the captive Paul entered Rome in the month of March, in the year 61, in the seventh year of the reign of Nero, under the consulate of Cæsennius Pætus and Petronius Turpilian.²⁶

CHAPTER XXII.

GLANCE AT THE WORK OF PAUL.

PAUL has still more than three years to live, and those three years will not be the least active of his laborious existence. We shall even show that the series of his apostolic tours had, according to all probabilities, a prolongation. But these new journeys were made in the Occident, and not in countries which he had already visited.¹ These journeys, if they took place, were moreover without appreciable results, as regards the propagation of Christianity. We are, therefore, permitted at this moment to take the dimensions of Paul's work. Thanks to him, one-half of Asia Minor received the seed of Christianity. In Europe, Macedonia was quite deeply penetrated, and Greece entered along her borders. If we add to this Italy, from Puteoli to Rome, already furrowed by the Christians, we shall have a picture of the actual conquests of Christianity during the sixteen years comprehended in this book. Syria, as we have seen, had, at a prior period, received the word of Jesus, and possessed organized churches. The progress of the new faith had been truly wonderful, and although the public still occupied itself very little with it, the followers of Jesus already possessed importance for those outside. We shall see them, towards the year 64, occupying the attention of the world, and acting a very important historical *rôle*.

In this entire history, moreover, it is important that we should protect ourselves from one illusion almost forcibly produced by the reading of the epistles of Paul, and the Acts of the apostles. After such a perusal, one's imagination is tempted to picture to itself conversions in mass, churches with numerous members, and whole countries flying to the new religion. Paul, who often speaks to us of rebellious Jews, never mentions the enormous

majority of Heathens who had no knowledge of the faith. In reading the travels of Benjamin of Tudela, one would imagine that the world of his day was only peopled with Jews. Sects are subject to these optical illusions; for them, nothing exists outside of their circle. The events which take place in their midst appear to them to be of interest to the universe. Persons who have connections with the old St. Simonians are struck with the readiness with which they regard themselves as the centre of humanity. In like manner, the primitive Christians lived so exclusively in their own circle that they knew scarcely nothing about the outside world. A country was reputed evangelized when the name of Jesus was pronounced there,² and half a score of persons had been converted. A church frequently contained no more than twelve or fifteen members. Probably all the converts of St. Paul in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, did not much exceed one thousand.³ This little number, this spirit of secret committee, of restricted spiritual family, was precisely what constituted the indestructible strength of these churches, and made of them so many fruitful germs for the future.

One man has contributed more than any other to this rapid extension of Christianity. This man has torn off that sort of tight and fearfully dangerous swaddling-clothes in which the child was wrapped from its birth. He has proclaimed that Christianity was not a simple reformed Judaism, but that it was a complete religion, existing by itself. To say that this man deserves to occupy a very high rank in history, is to say a very evident thing; but he must not be called a founder. It is vain for Paul to talk; He is inferior to the other apostles. He has not seen Jesus; He has not heard his word. The divine *logia* and the parables are scarcely known to him. The Christ who gives him personal revelations, is his own phantom,—it is himself he hears, while thinking he hears Jesus.

Even as regards the question of outward *rôle*, Paul was far from having the importance, during his life, that we attribute

to him. His churches were either slightly substantial, or denied him. The churches of Macedonia and Galatia, which are his own work, possessed little importance in the second and third centuries. The churches of Corinth and Ephesus, which did not belong to him with so exclusive a title, pass over to his enemies, or are not deemed canonically enough established, when only owing their existence to him.⁴ After his disappearance from the scene of apostolic struggles we shall find him soon forgotten. His death was probably regarded by his enemies as the death of an agitator. The second century scarcely speaks of him, and apparently endeavors to systematically blot out his memory. His epistles are then slightly read, and only regarded as authority by rather a slim group.⁵ His partisans themselves greatly weaken his pretensions.⁶ He leaves no celebrated disciples. Titus, Timothy, and so many others, who, as it were, constituted his court, disappear without renown. The truth is, Paul was personally too energetic to form an original school. He always crushed his disciples. With him they only fill the characters of secretaries, servants, and couriers. Their respect for their master was such that they never dared to teach freely. When Paul was with his band, he alone existed; all the others were annihilated, or only lived through him.⁷

In the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, Paul will increase wonderfully. He will become the teacher *par excellence*,—the founder of Christian theology. The true president of those great Greek Councils, which make Jesus the keystone of a system of metaphysics, is the apostle Paul. But in the middle ages, especially in the Occident, his fortune will undergo a strange eclipse. Paul will say scarcely nothing to the heart of the barbarians. Outside of Rome, he will possess no legend. Latin Christendom will hardly pronounce his name, except after that of his rival. St. Paul, in the middle ages, is, in some degree, lost in the glory of St. Peter. While St. Peter moves the world, and makes every one tremble and obey,—the obscure *St. Pou* plays a secondary part in the great Christian poem which

fills the cathedrals and inspires the popular chants. Scarcely any one before the sixteenth century is called by his name. He hardly appears in the emblematical monuments. He has no devotees; they build him but few churches;⁸ they burn no tapers to him. His surroundings—Titus, Timothy, Phebe, and Lydia,—occupy but little place in the public worship, above all of the Latins.⁹ No legend to will it. In order to possess a legend, it is necessary to have spoken to the people, to have excited the imagination. Now, what does salvation through faith, justification through the blood of Christ, say to the people? There was too little sympathy between Paul and the popular conscience, and probably he was also too well known to history, in order that an aureola of fables should have formed itself around his head. Talk to me of Peter, who bends the heads of kings, shatters empires, walks upon the asp and the basilisk, treads under foot the lion and the dragon, and holds the keys of heaven!

The Reformation opens for St. Paul a new era of glory and authority. Catholicism itself, through more extended studies than those of the middle ages, is led back to quite just views concerning the apostle of the Gentiles. Dating from the sixteenth century, the name of Paul is omnipresent. But the Reformation, which rendered so much service to science and reason, was not able to create a legend. Rome, throwing a pleasing veil over the rudeness of the Epistle to the Galatians, elevates Paul upon a pedestal almost equal to that of Peter. Paul does not therefore become to any great extent the saint of the people. What place shall criticism assign him? To what rank shall it elevate him in the hierarchy of those who served the ideal?

We serve the ideal by doing good, discovering the truth, and realizing the beautiful. At the head of the holy procession of humanity, walks the good man, the virtuous man; the second rank belongs to the searcher after truth, the scientific man, the philosopher: then comes the man of the beautiful, the artist,

the poet. Jesus appears to us under his celestial aureola, like an ideal of goodness and beauty. Peter loved Jesus, understood him; and was, it appears, in spite of a few weaknesses, an excellent man. What was Paul? He was not a saint. The dominant feature of his character is not goodness. He was haughty, pertinacious, aggressive; he defended himself, maintained his point (as is said in our days); his expressions were harsh; he deemed himself absolutely in the right; he clung to his opinions; he quarrelled with different persons. He was not learned. It may even be said that he greatly injured science by his paradoxical contempt for reason, by his eulogy upon apparent folly, by his apotheosis of transcendental absurdity. Nor was he a poet either. His writings, works of the greatest originality, are without charm. Their form is harsh, and almost always devoid of grace. What was he then?

He was an eminent man of action; of powerful soul, progressive, enthusiastic; a conqueror, a missionary, a propagator; the more ardent, from having at first displayed his fanaticism in an opposite direction. Now the man of action, noble as he is when he has a noble design in view, is less near God than he who has lived upon the pure love of the actual, the good, or the beautiful. By nature the apostle is a little narrow-minded. He wishes to succeed,—for this he makes sacrifices. Contact with reality always sullies a little. The first places in the kingdom of heaven are reserved for those whom a ray of grace has reached; those who have only worshipped the ideal. The man of action is always a poor artist, for his sole design is not to reflect the splendor of the universe. He could not become a man of learning, for he regulates his opinions according to political utility. He is not even a very virtuous man, for he is never irreproachable,—the foolishness and wickedness of men forcing him to covenant with them. Above all, he is never agreeable. Reserve, the most charming of virtues, is forbidden him. The world favors the bold,—those who help themselves. Paul, so great, so upright, is obliged to decree to himself the title of

apostle. Our faults render us strong in action, — our good qualities weaken us. All in all, that historical character which bears most analogy to St. Paul, is Luther. In both there is the same violence in language,¹⁰ the same passion, the same energy, the same noble independence, the same frantic attachment to a thesis embraced as the absolute truth.

I persist, therefore, in thinking that the part taken by Paul in the creation of Christianity, should be ranked far below that of Jesus. According to my opinion, Paul should even occupy a position beneath Francis d'Assisi and the author of the "Imitation," both of whom saw Jesus in close proximity. The Son of God stands alone. To appear for a moment, to reflect a soft and profound refulgence, to die very young, is the life of a God. To struggle, dispute, and conquer, is the life of a man. After having been for three centuries, thanks to orthodox Protestantism, the Christian teacher *par excellence*, Paul sees in our day his reign drawing to a close. Jesus, on the contrary, lives more than ever. It is no longer the Epistle to the Romans, which is the *resumé* of Christianity, — it is the Sermon on the Mount. True Christianity, which will last forever, comes from the gospels, — not from the epistles of Paul. The writings of Paul have been a danger and a hidden rock, — the causes of the principal defects of Christian theology. Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, of the unfruitful Thomas Aquinas, of the gloomy Calvinist, of the peevish Jansenist, of the fierce theology which damns and predestinates to damnation. Jesus is the father of all those who seek repose for their souls in dreams of the ideal. What makes Christianity live, is the little that we know of the word and person of Jesus. The ideal man, the divine poet, the great artist, alone defy time and revolutions. They alone are seated at the right hand of God the Father for ever more.

O Humanity! thou art just, at times, and certain of thy judgments are good.

NOTES TO SAINT PAUL.

INTRODUCTION.

1. II. Thess. ii. 2.
2. II. Thess. iii. 17; I. Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; Gal. vi. 2.
3. In the following discussion, I call "superscription" the first phrase, *Παῦλος, ἀπόστολος*, etc. I call "title" the indication placed at the head of each epistle in the manuscript, *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πρὸς Ἑβραίους*, etc.
4. Col. i. 15, and following.
5. Comp. Col. ii. 2, 3.
6. Notice *πλήρωμα*, with a particular shade of meaning (i. 19, ii. 9); the expression *τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ* (iii. 24), *φανερῶσαι* (iii. 4), for the *παρουσία* of Christ; the compound words *πιθανολογία, ἐξελο-
γρησκέα, ὀφθαλμοδοουλεία*. The rare use of particles, a remarkable taste for gathering together parts of sentences joined by the relative pronoun or by the participial connection, and certain other small idioms, are very unlike the usual style of Paul.
7. Col. i. 16-19.
8. Col. i. 20.
9. Col. iii. 11. Comp. Gal. iii. 28; Col. ii. 5. Comp. I. Cor. v. 3.
10. *Πρεσβύτης* of Philem. 9, is surprising. The same may be said of the propose dtravels, Phil. ii. 24; Philem. 22. Compare Rom. xv. 23, and following; Acts xx. 25, not forgetting the traditions respecting the journeyings of St. Paul in Spain. The salutations (Col. iv. 10, 11, 14; Philem. 23, 24) are somewhat embarrassing. One is surprised to find such intimate relations existing between Paul and the cities of the valley of Lycus, where he had not sojourned.
11. Below page 274, and following. See especially Rom. ix. 5; I. Cor. viii. 6; II. Cor. v. 19.
12. Apoc. xix. 13, Hebr. i. 2, — writings dated with the greatest precision, and only three or four years after the time at which Paul must have written the Epistle to the Colossians.
13. Epiphanius, Hær. xlii. 9.
14. Note the *χαίρεις* (Eph. vi. 21), comparing it with Col. iv. 7.
15. Eph. i. 11-14; ii. 11, and following; iii. 1, and following; iv. 17.

16. Eph. i. 13, 15; ii. 11, and following; iii. 1-13; iv. 20, etc. Note especially the passages, iii. 2, iv. 21, which give the impression that among those to whom Paul writes there may be some whom he does not know.
17. If the Epistle to the Romans was encyclical (see, further, p. lxxii. and following), our present reasoning is all the more forcible.
18. Against Eunomius, ii. 19. *Οὕτω καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδωκάσι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὐρήκαμεν.* This treatise was written about the year 365.
19. Origen, passage taken from a *Chain* in Tischendorf; Nov. Test., 7th edition (Leipsc, 1859), p. 441, note; Tertullian *against Marcion*, v. 11. 17; — passages which presuppose that neither Marcion nor Tertullian had the words ἐν Εφέσω in their manuscripts, in the first verse. If this be not so, first, it would be impossible to understand the opinion of Marcion; secondly, Tertullian would overwhelm him with this text. Now Tertullian opposes Marcion solely with the title πρὸς Εφεσίους, and with the authority of the church (Saint Jerome). Third, Eph. i. 1, in which *quidam* refers undoubtedly to Origen.
20. See further, p. xix., note 1.
21. Tertullian, l. c. Compare, however, Epiph. hæc. xlii. 9, 11, 12; Canon of Muratori, lines 62-67.
22. It may be also that his attributing this was the result of a conjecture arising from the comparing of Eph. vi. 21, 22, with II. Tim. iv. 12.
23. Cf. Rom. i. 7; II. Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1.
24. Comp. Eph. ii. with Col. i. 13-22, and with Col. ii. 12-14; Eph. iii. 1-12, with Col. i. 25-28; Eph. iii. 18, 19, with Col. ii. 2, 3; Eph. iv. 3-16, with Col. iii. 14; Eph. v. 21, vi. 4, with Col. iii. 18-21; Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13, with Col. ii. 9, 10. On the contrary, Eph. iv. 14, and v. 6, is less developed than Col. ii. 4-23, the passage against false doctors necessarily presenting only general features of resemblance in an epistle without address.
25. *Καὶ ὑμεῖς.* Comp. Col. iv. 17.
26. Comp., for example, Eph. iv. 2, 32, v. 1, with Col. iii. 12, 13. The imitation, in this case, is of such a nature that it can only be the work of a servile copyist. Comp. also, Eph. iv. 11, with I. Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iii. 8, with I. Cor. xv. 9; Eph. iii. 9, with I. Cor. iv. 1; Eph. i. 20, with Rom. viii. 34; Eph. iv. 17, and following, with Rom. i. 21, and following; Eph. vi. 17, with I. Thess. v. 8.
27. *Διαβολὸς, σωτήριον, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, τὰ πνευματικά,* for *τὰ πνεύματα, φωτίζειν* in the sense of teaching, *οἰκονομία* applied to the divine plan, the peculiar construction of *πληροῦσθαι, ὅστε γινώσκουτες, βασιλεία τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ, κοσμοκράτορες*, etc. The salutation (vi. 23, 24) is most extraordinary. The vaunting of iii. 4, is still more so.
28. Ch. ii. and iii., especially.

29. I. 19, and following; ii. 2; iii. 9, and following; 18, 19; iv. 13; vi. 12.
Comp. Valentine, in the *Philosophumena*, vi. 34.
30. See especially, ii. 1-22.
31. Eph. iv. 8-10; v. 14; vi. 2, 3.
32. Eph. iii. 5. The *Codex Vaticanus* omits ἀποστόλοις (cf. Col. i. 26); but the *Codex Sinaiticus* gives this word. Comp. Eph. iii. 8; I. Cor. xv. 9, and also Eph. ii. 20.
33. Eph. v. 22, and following. Comp. I. Cor. vii.
34. Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21, 22.
35. If the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians was the Epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned in Col. iv. 16, one can not understand why St. Paul should command both churches to lend to each other two writings so similar. Moreover, as the Epistle addressed to the Colossians, with whom Paul had had no personal relations (Col. ii. 1), contains a local part, salutations, etc., why should not the Epistle to the Laodiceans contain them? Finally, it is not comprehensible how ἐν Λαοδιχείᾳ should become ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, or have disappeared.
36. Καὶ ὑμεῖς (vi. 21) is thus explained.
37. The absence of the name of Timothy in the superscription of the Epistle to the Ephesians, at the same time that this name appears in the superscription of the Epistle to the Colossians, as well as in the superscriptions of the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, confirms this supposition.
38. Origen offers a similar hypothesis to explain the peculiarities of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25.
39. Cf. I. Petri, i. 1, 2, 3 (Eph. i. 1, 3, 4, 7); ii. 18 (Eph. vi. 5); iii. 1, and following (Eph. v. 22, and following); iii. 22 (Eph. i. 20, and following); v. 5 (Eph. v. 21).
40. Polycarp, epistle *ad Phil.*, c. 1, and c. 12 (perhaps interpolated); Ignatius *ad Eph.* c. 6 (interpolated), c. 12; Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.* v. ii. 3; Clement of Alexandria, *Cohort ad Gentes*, c. 9; *Strom.* iv. 8; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v. 11, 17; Valentine, in the *Philosophumena*, vi. 34; Canon of Muratori, line 50.
41. For example, the formula χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη (cf. ii. Joh. 3), πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα, λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες, λόγος ὑγιής, υγιαίνειν ἐν τῇ πίστει βέβηλος, αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος, παραδήκη, ευσεβεία, ευσεβῶς, ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ, ζητήσεις, ἐπιφάνεια (in place of παρουσία), σωτήρ applied to the Deity, ματαιολόγος, ματαιολογία, λογομαχία, λογομαχεῖν, κενοφωνία, σωφρονισμός, σωφρόνως, σῶφρων, παραιτεῖσθαι, περιῦσθαι, ἄστοχεῖν, υπομιμνησκεῖν, παρὰ κολουθεῖν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, προσέχειν, ἀρνεῖσθαι, καλὰ ἔργα, δεσπότης in place of κυριος, etc. The greater number of these expressions recur frequently in these three epistles. They

are wanting, or are rare, in the authentic epistles. With a dictionary as limited as that of the writers of the New Testament, the reasons which we have just given have always great force. The average number of times which a word must recur in a certain number of the pages of an author, especially of an author like Saint Paul, is almost certain. In like manner, an assemblage of words unusual to an author, meeting as if by appointment in a few pages, proves that these pages do not belong to the writer in question. Now, what especially characterizes our three epistles is the constant recurrence of the same words, and which are not found, or found but seldom, in the other epistles.

42. For example, the solemn superscriptions (compare Philem. 1); and yet Paul was less intimate with Philemon than with Titus and Timothy. The details into which Paul enters in regard to his apostleship (I. Tim. i. 11, and following; ii. 7), details which, addressed to a disciple, are entirely useless; the enumeration of his virtues (II. Tim. iii. 10, 11); his assurance of final salvation (II. Tim. iv. 8; cf. I. Cor. iv. 3, 4; ix. 27; I. Tim. i. 13) comes well from the pen of a disciple of Paul's, not from the pen of Paul himself. I. Tim. ii. 2, has no meaning in the latter years of Nero's reign; that was written after the accession of Vespasian. *Ibid.* v. 18, we find quoted as *γρμφή*, a passage of Luke, x. 7; but the Gospel of St. Luke did not exist, at least as *γραφή*, before the death of Paul. Finally, the organization of the churches, the hierarchy, the priestly and episcopal power, are, in these epistles, much more developed than we can suppose them to have been in the last years of the life of Paul (see Titus i. 5, etc.) Timothy received the spiritual gifts, the "imposition of hands," by the college of the priests of Lystra (I. Tim. ii. 15; iv. 14). The doctrine on marriage (I. Tim. ii. 15; iv. 3; v. 14; cf. iii. 4, 12; v. 10) is also of a more advanced age of the church, and seems to contradict I. Cor. vii. 8-25, et seq. The destination of the Epistles to Timothy is reputed to be Ephesus. How is it that we do not find in these epistles any message or salutation expressly for the Ephesians?
43. Observe, for example, II. Tim. iii. 10, 11, or else I. Tim. i. 3, et seq. 20; and the mention of Pontius Pilate, I. Tim. vi. 13, etc.
44. Remark the insignificance of the passage (I. Tim. iii. 14, 15) which seeks to give the reason for these useless delays.
45. Notice *ψυδωνύμου γνώσεως*, I. Tim. vi. 20.
46. Compare I. Tim. i. 4; iv. 7; II. Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9; I. Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; I. Tim. iv. 1, et seq.; II. Tim. iii. 1, et seq.; I. Tim. ii.; II. Tim. i. 11. Notice the analogy in the beginning of the matter. I. Tim. i. 3, and Tit. i. 5.
47. II. Tim. i. 3 (Rom. i. 9), 7 (Rom. viii. 15); ii. 20 (Rom. ix. 21); iv. 6 (Phil. i. 30; ii. 17; iii. 12, et seq.)

48. Notice that Timothy was young when these two epistles were addressed to him. I. Tim. iv. 12; II. Tim. ii. 22.
49. Lamennais certainly changed much. His style, nevertheless, kept always the most perfect unity.
50. See p. 251, et seq. There is no time in the life of Paul when we better know his plans of travel. Paul, it is true, modified several times these plans, but he never varied his intention of not returning by the way of Ephesus. The reason is evident; he had just passed three years there.
51. I. Tim. iii. 15; v. 9, 17, 19, 20.
52. I. Tim. i.
53. Notice, particularly, Acts xx. 29, et. seq., where these errors are foretold.
54. Phil. i. 1; ii. 19; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1; Heb. xiii. 23.
55. *Παρηχολούθησάς μου* implies that Timothy was an eye-witness of these facts, and was implicated in them. In fact, why does the writer choose, for example, the trials of Paul in Galatia, if not because he knows that to be the country of Timothy?
56. See Chap. xvi., note 44; and Chap. xvii., note 96. Even admitting that *μεχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικου* implies that Paul was very near Illyria, the fact that he was at Nicopolis in no way aids the question. *Ἰλλυρικόν*, in whatever sense we take the word, did not descend lower than the Acroceraunian Mountains. Epirus never made part—at least in the time of the great empire—of the province of Illyria, nor of *Ἰλλυρικόν*, in any sense. The pretorian province of *Illyria juxta Epirum*, now high Albania (Strabo, xvii. iii. 25), was bounded by the Acroceraunian Mountains, Mount Scardus, and the Drilo. At Berea, Paul was nearer Illyria than he had been at Nicopolis.
57. *Τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ επαυσάμην μετα δακρύων νουθετῶν ἐν ἑκάστῳ.*
58. See p. 257, et seq.
59. II. Cor. x. 14–16.
60. I. Tim. i. 3, supposes that Paul writes to his disciple for the first time since his departure from Ephesus.
61. Compare Col. i. 25; II. Cor. x. 16; Rom. xvi. 26. It is not for us to explain the contradiction between II. Tim. iv. 17, 18, and II. Tim. iv. 6–8. To make II. Tim. iv. 16, 17, refer to the first captivity as retrospective historical information, is simply absurd, especially when we read these two verses in connection with the 18th.
62. Acts xx. 25.
63. Phil. ii. 24; Philem. 22.
64. Thus Onesiphorus and Alexander the coppersmith are assigned to Rome and Ephesus in a manner not explained, II. Tim. i. 16–18; iv. 14, 15.
65. In Eusebius, ii. E. ii. 25.

66. It seems also that there are some reminiscences from the first Epistle of Peter. Compare I. Tim. ii. 9, et seq., to I. Pet. iii. 1, et seq.
67. II. Tim. iv. 9, et seq.
68. II. Tim. i. 15, 16, et seq., especially verse 18; ii. 17, et seq.; iv. 14, et seq., particularly verse 15.
69. Note, however, II. Tim. iii. 11. Compare, also, Acts xx. 25, and II. Tim. iv. 7.
70. There are yet other apocryphal Epistles of Paul since the second century. Canon of Muratori, lines 62-67; Epiph. hæ. xlii. 9, 11, 12; *St. Jerome, De Viris Ill.*, 5; Theodoret, on Col. iv. 16, et seq.
71. Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 17.
72. *Ad Autolyc.*, iii. 14.
73. *Contra Hær.* i. proem, i.
74. *Stromates*, ii. 11.
75. *Præser.* 25.
76. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* v. 21; Epiph. Hær. xlii. 9.
77. *Epist.* i. *ad Cor.* 2, 29.
78. *Ad Eph.* 2.
79. *Ad Phil.* 4.
80. In Eusebius, H. E. iii. 32. Compare I. Tim. i. 3-6, 10; vi. 20. See Baur. *Paulus* (2d edition), vol. ii, p. 110-112.
81. See above, p. 33.
82. For example, ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία, *sana doctrina*.
83. On the Stichometry in the old manuscripts, see Fr. Ritschl, *Opuscula philologica*, I. p. 74, et seq.; 173, et seq.; 190, et seq.
84. This Stichometry (fol. 463, v.) places in the list of sacred writings an *Epistula Barnabæ*, which may be the epistle usually attributed to Barnabas. Nevertheless, the Stichometry of the *Codex Claromontanus* gives to his *Epistula Barnabæ* a number of στίχοι, which is nearly the figure belonging to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not that which belongs to the epistle usually attributed to Barnabas (see Credner, *Gesch des neutest. Kanon*, p. 175, et seq.; 242 et seq.) It is supposed that the *Epistula Barnabæ*, mentioned in the Stichometry of the *Codex Claromontanus*, was the Epistle to the Hebrews that Tertullian attributed to Barnabas. That which confirms this reasoning is, first, that the Stichometry of the *Claromontanus* contains many faults and peculiarities; second, that the epistle commonly attributed to Barnabas is found in the *Codex Sinaiticus* with the *Pastor*, in a way which seems to agree with the Stichometry of the *Claromontanus* (see, however, Tertullian, *De Pudic.* 20).
85. Tischendorf, *Codex Claromontanus*, p. xvi.
86. Epiph. Hær. xlii. 9.

87. Etienne Gobar, in Photius. *Biblioth. cod.* ccxxxiii. p. 291 (Bekker); Euseb. H. E. v. 26. In his polemic against the heresies, Irenæus cites frequently all the Epistles of Paul; he does not quote the Epistle to the Hebrews, which would answer his purpose so well.
88. Cited by Eusebius, H. E., vi. 13, 14.
89. *Homil. in Hebr.* cited by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25; *Epist. ad Africanum*, c. 9. In *Matth. Comment.*, series 28; *De Princip. præf.* i.; iii. 1, 10; iv. 22.
90. *De Pudicitia*, 20. Tertullian, moreover, does not make the same use of it as of the other Epistles of Paul. He does not reproach Marcion for suppressing it.
91. Eusebius, H. E. vi. 20; St. Jerome, *De Viris ill.* 59.
92. Photius, l. c., et cod. cxxi. p. 94 (Bekker). The Epistle to the Hebrews is not quoted in the *Philosophumena*, although all the other great epistles are quoted there several times.
93. *Ad Fortunatum, de exhort. mart.* 11.
94. Quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 41.
95. Council of Antioch, in the year 264, in Mansi, *Coll. concil.* i. p. 1038; Alexander of Alexandria, in Theodoret, H. E. i. 3, and in Socrates, H. E. i, 6, Athanasius, *Epist. fest.* (Opp. i. p. 962, edit. Bénéd.) *Synopsis script. sacr.* (Opp. i. p. 130, 197.); St. Greg. of Naz., *Carmina*, p. 201 and 1105 (edit. Caillau).
96. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 3, 38; vi. 13; St. Greg. of Naz., *op cit.*, p. 1105.
97. Saint Jerome, *In Is.*, c. vi., vii., viii.; *In Zach.* viii.; *In Matt.* xxvi.; *De Viris ill.*, 59; *Epist. ad Paulinum*, ii.; *De stud. script.* (vol. iv. 2d part. col. 574, Martianay); *Epist. ad Dardanum* (ii. 608, Mart.); Saint Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, xvi. 22; Primasius, *Comment. in epist. Pauli*, præf. (in the *Max. Bibl. Vet. Patrum*. Lugd., x. p. 144); Philaster, *De Heresibus*, hæc. lxi. (in Galandi, *Bibl. Vet. Patrum*, vii. p. 494, 495); Isidore of Seville, *De eccl. officiis*, i. xii. 11. Remark, especially, the little use that is made of this epistle by the Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries.
98. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 3; vi. 20; St. Jerome, *De Viris ill.* 59. Hilaire, deacon of the church of Rome (Ambrosian) expounds the "thirteen" Epistles of Paul, not the Epistle to the Hebrews.
99. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 38.
100. *Epis. ad Dardanum*, i. c.; *In Jer.* xxxi.; *in Tit.* i. 5; ii. 2; *De Viris ill.* 5.
101. *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, i. § 50; *Inchoata expositio ep. ad Rom.* § 11. Comp. *De doctrina christ.* ii. § 13.
102. Passages of Eusebius, of Saint Jerome, of Primasius, of Philaster, of Isidore of Seville, before cited.
103. Passages above alluded to.

104. See particularly x. 5, where the argument is based on a fault of the reading, or of the copyist; *ἡΔελησασσώμα* for *ἡΔελησασσωτια*.
105. Gal. ii. 7, 8; II. Cor. x. 13, et seq.; Rom. xv. 20, et seq.
106. vii. 27; viii. 3, 4; ix. 6-10; xiii. 11-13. We will examine in the fourth volume the objections which are made to this argument.
107. Compare x. 34.
108. Remark *ὁνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν θεατριζόμενοι*, observing the last word. All this will be treated in our fourth volume. We will also explain there the passage *τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν . . . προσεδεξάσθαι* (x. 34) by details of the same time. *Δεσμοῖς μου* (*ibid.*) is an awkward correction for *δεσμίους*.
109. The author of the letter gives news of Timothy. He supposes the persecution by Nero and the death of the apostles to be known. We are then led to believe that when he wrote, these facts were already old; x. 34, however, prevents our believing them to be long passed.
110. The final notes, which, in the accepted text of the New Testament and in the versions derived from it, claim to point out the place where the epistle was written and the name of the bearer, are, from modern scholiasts, void of all value.
111. II. Cor. x. 13, et seq.; Rom. xv. 20, et seq.
112. Griesbach, *Nov. Test.* ii. p. 212, 213.
113. Note especially verses 8, 9.
114. *Ibid.* verses 9, 12.
115. II. Cor. viii. 6; ix. 5; xii. 18. Cf. I. Tim. i. 3. See Saint John Chrysostom, on this last passage.
116. See p. 255.
117. II. Tim. iv. 21, a passage which has historical value, although the letter is apocryphal.
118. I. Cor. xvi. 19.
119. iv. 19. Ephesus is always the aim of the author of the epistles to Timothy, although in this respect he shows himself inconsistent. The orthodox theologians, who understand literally Rom. xvi. 3, and ii. Tim. iv. 19, are obliged to make Aquila and Priscilla travel from Rome to Corinth and Ephesus (Acts xviii. 2, 18, 19-26); from Ephesus to Rome (Rom. i. c.); from Rome to Ephesus (II. Tim. i. c.). It seems, even, that they would like to reserve means to make them return a second time from Ephesus to Rome. De Rossi, *Bull. di arch. crist.* 1867, p. 44. et seq.
120. Edit. of Roswlyde, Antwerp, 1613. Cf. De Rossi, l. c. and *Roma sott.* ii. p. xxviii. xxix.
121. Note, for example, the name of Phlegon.

122. In part, in consequence of the ordinance of *Claudius* in reference to the assumption of Roman names. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.
123. *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 63.
124. In the uncertainty of the manuscripts *à propos* of the place of verse 24. See Griesbach, *Nov. Test.* ii. p. 222.
125. See the editions of these *Codices* given by Matthæi (Meissen, 1791), and by Scrivener (Cambridge, 1859), or Griesbach, *Nov. Test.* ii. p. 212. In the *Bernerianus*, a blank is left at the end of Chap. xiv. In the *Claromontanus*, the passage is found at the end of Chap. xvi. but we feel that the correctors have taken it on suspicion (Tischendorf, *Codex Clarom.* p. 550).
126. See Origen, *Comment. on the Epistle to the Romans*, book x. 43. It is evident that here Marcion was not influenced by any dogmatic view.
127. See Col. iv. 16, and above, p. 18, et seq. It is remarkable that the author of the 1^a *Petri*, which makes use of the Epistles of Paul, uses chiefly the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Ephesians. — that is to say, the two epistles which are general treatises, catechisms.
128. We will see the epistles called “catholic” come out in an analogous manner.
129. Perhaps the edition of Paul’s letters was made at Rome.
130. See how we can suppose the four exemplars arranged : —
 - 1^o Exemplar of the church of Rome ; the first eleven chapters, + the entire fifteenth chapter.
 - 2^o Exemplar of the church of Ephesus ; the first fourteen chapters (with some modifications in the first half of the first chapter), + xvi. 1–20.
 - 3^o Exemplar of Thessalonica ; the first fourteen chapters (with some modifications in the first half of the first chapter) + xvi. 21–24.
 - 4^o Exemplar addressed to an unknown church ; the first fourteen chapters (with some modifications in the first half of the first chapter) + xvi. 25–27, —verses which, as we have already said, in many manuscripts, follow immediately the last words of the fourteenth chapter.
131. Note especially the following passages : ii. 16 ; xi. 13 ; xvi. 25.
132. See Chap. xvii., note 65.
133. In the seventh verse we read *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ* to the v. 15 : *ὑμῖν εὐαγγελισάσθαι*. See the edition of Matthæi (Meissen, 791.)

CHAPTER I.

1. Acts xiii. 4, et seq.
2. The natural boundary of Syria is Mount Casius.
3. The site of the town is now desolate. There are remaining some beautiful ruins, and admirable works in the rock. V. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvii. p. 1233, et seq.; *Etudes de Theol. de Phil. et d'Hist.* published by some Fathers of the Soc. of Jesus, Sept. 1860.
4. Continuation of the Amanus.
5. Juvenal, iii. 62, et seq.
6. Vaillant, *Numism. græca imp. rom.* p. 30, 46, 110; Mionnet, *Descr. des méd. ant.*, § 271, et seq.
7. It is possible that the works actually existing are of the second century, or later.
8. The railroad which unites them and Europe with Syria, the basin of the Tigris and the Euphrates, Persia, and India, can not border upon the Mediterranean except by the valley of Orontes. It will end at Seleucia, or the port Saint Simeon of the Crusades, near there.
9. Ammian Marcellin., xxii. 14.
10. Mischna, *Schebiit*, vi. 1; *Challah*, iv. 8; Tosiphta, *Challah*, ch. 2; Talmud of Jer., *Schebiit*, vi. 2; Talmud of Babylon, *Gittin*, 8, a; Targum of Jerusalem, *Numbers* xxxiv. 8; Saint Jerome, *Epist. ad Dardanum* (Martianey, ii. 609). Cf. Neubauer, *la Geogr. du Talmud*, p. 5, et seq.
11. Acts ix. 4, 8; xx. 13. It is true that *πεξέθειν* in this second case can simply be opposed to *πλεῖν*.
12. Clement Rom. *ad Cor.* l. c. 5.
13. Cf. Deut. xxv. 3; cf. Mischna, *Maccoth*, iii. 10. The Acts do not mention any of these scourgings. Comp. Gal. vi. 17.
14. The Acts (xvi. 22) mention only one of these scourgings. *Παβδευσεις* in Clement Roman *ad Cor.* i. 5, is a false reading. It must be *φυγαδευσεις*. See the reviews of Laurent, and of Hilgenfeld.
15. Acts xlv. 19; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 5.
16. These three shipwrecks are unknown to the author of the Acts; for the one which he relates (xxvii.) is posterior to the date when Paul wrote the passage which we quote.
17. Doubtless upon some remains of the ship, swimming to escape death.
18. II. Cor. xi. 23-27, Comp. I. Thess. ii. 9; Gal. v. 2; I. Cor. iv. 11-13; xv. 30, 31; II. Cor. iv. 8, et seq. 17; vi. 4, et seq; Rom. viii. 35, 36.
19. I. Cor. ix. 5, et seq.
20. Gal. vi. 6; I. Cor. ix. 7, et seq.

21. I. Cor. ix. 4, et seq; II. Cor. xi. 9, et seq; xii. 13, 14, 16; I. Thess. ii. 5, 7-9; II. Thess. iii. 8, et seq; Phil. iv. 15; Acts xx. 33, 34.
22. II. Thess. iii. 10-12.
23. Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34; I. Thess. ii. 9; II. Thess. iii. 8; I. Cor., iv. 12.
24. Acts xiii. 14-16; xvi. 13; xvii. 2.
25. Luke iv. 16.
26. Acts xiii. 52; xv. 3, 31.
27. Acts xi. 19.
28. Acts xi. 20; xxi. 16.
29. Jos. *Ant.* XIII. x. 4; XVII. xii. 1, 2; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, § 36.
30. Porto-Costanzo, two leagues north of Famagouste. The city has nearly disappeared.
31. Now, Bapho.
32. Strabo XIV. vi. 3; chart of Peutinger, Segm. IX. F; Pliny, v. 35; Ptolemy, V. xiv. 1; Pomponius Mela, II. vii. 5.
33. The province in fact was Senatorial. Strabo XIV. vi. 6; XVII. iii. 25; Dion Cassius, LIV. 4; proconsular money of Cyprus; *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 2632.
34. Sergius Paulus is unknown elsewhere. It must be remembered that the proconsuls of the Senatorial provinces were annual, and that Cyprus was the smallest of the Roman provinces. The text, the proconsular coins, and the inscriptions of Cyprus do not make it possible to arrange a correct list of the proconsuls of this isle. We can with some degree of certainty identify the personage of Acts with the naturalist of the same name cited by Pliny (index of authors at the beginning of book II. and book XVIII.) Lucius Sergius Paulus, consul in the year 168, and his daughter Sergia Paulina, who gave their name to a celebrated domestic college (Orelli, 2414, 4938; Gruter, 1117, 7; Fabretti, *Inscr. dom.* p. 146, No. 178, Amaduzzi, *Anecd. litt.*, I. p. 476, Nos. 39, 4; Otto Jahn, *Specimen epigraph.*, p. 79, et seq.) were very probably the descendants of our Sergius Paulus. Borghesi, *Fastes consul.* [still unpublished] in the year 168.
35. Comp. Jos. *Ant.* XX. vii. 2.
36. An Arabian word of which the plural is *ouléma*. The word does not exist either in Hebrew or in Aramean, which renders this etymology of *Elymas* very doubtful.
37. The parallelism of the two recitals raises some doubts of the credibility of the whole episode. It seems that on several points they have sought to model the legend of Paul on that of Peter.
38. A proconsul was a person of considerable importance, and it is probable that if such a thing had occurred we should have known it from the Roman historians, as in the case of Pomponia Græcina, Flavius Clemens, and Flavia Domitilla. The author of the Acts was here

misled by his idea of converting the greatest possible number of heathens, by the pleasure of showing the Roman magistrates favorable to the new religion, and by the desire of placing St. Paul forthwith as apostle of the Gentiles. Elsewhere, we will notice in the narrator of the Acts this *naïf* sentiment which makes the man of the people proud of having been connected with men of celebrity, or importance. It seems that he wished to reply to adversaries who held that the Christians were all people of low estate, and little known.

39. Compare Acts xxv. 22, et seq.
40. Compare Rom. xv. 19; II. Cor. xii. 12.
41. See Valerius Maximus, whole of book I.
42. See hereafter the adventure of Lystra, and Acts xxviii. 6.
43. It is thus that the Mussulmans in Syria acknowledged the miracles of the Christians, and sought to benefit by them, without, on that account, dreaming of themselves becoming Christians.
44. Acts xiii. 7.
45. *De Viris Ill.* 5.
46. And he speaks of it, xiii. 9.
47. Inscr. in Garrucci, *Dissert. arch.* II. p. 160 (*Cocotio qui et Juda*). Cf. Orelli, *Inscr. lat.*, No. 2522.
48. The name of Paul is very common among the Cilicians. V. Pape. *Wört. der griech. Eigennamen*, 23d. edit. p. 1150.
49. This transition is indicated with much tact, Acts xiii. 1-13, Gal. ii. 1. 9, proves that Paul himself took it thus.
50. Acts xiv. 12.
51. Acts xiii. 13.
52. Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38-39.
53. The first time that we know of Paul taking this title is at the head of the Epistle to the Galatians. Let us remember that the author of the Acts avoids giving it to him directly.
54. Acts ix. 15; xxvi. 17, 18.

CHAPTER II.

1. Comp. Acts xv. 23.
2. Let it suffice to recall Apollonius of Perga, Aratus, Dio. of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Epictetus, Dios Chrysostom, Pausanias, Dioscorides, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Alexander of Tralles, Soranus, Rufus of Ephesus, Aretas, Galian, Phlegon of Tralles. On Pergamos, Sardis, Tarsus, Nysa, see Strabo (XIII. iv. 3, 9; XIV. i. 48; v. 13-15).
3. At the present time the form of the houses in Caria, in Lycia, is more Archaic than in any other place in the world.

4. For Lycaonia, see Acts xiv. 11 (cf. Etienne de Byz. at the word *Λέυβη*); for Lycia, Dio Cassius, XL. 17 (Sturz. iii. p. 759); for Cappadocia and Paphlagonia, Strabo, XII. iii. 25; for the Pisidians, and the Solymæans, Strabo, XIII. iv. 17. The Lydian had disappeared in Lydia; Strabo, XII. iv. 17. In Mysia and in Bithynia there was no longer anything but Greek spoken: Strabo, XII. iv. 6. For Galatia, see Strabo, XII. v. 1. The passage of St. Jerome, *Comm. in Epist. ad Gal.*, I. ii. prol., is of little weight. Gallic names disappeared in Galatia towards the time of Tiberius; Perrot, *De Galatia prov. rom.*, p. 88, et seq. In Phrygia, country people and slaves speak only the Phrygian language. See the numerous explanations of words compiled in the "*Arice*" of P. Bœticher, and in the *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, by the same author.
5. Great progress in this respect was made by Vespasian, Henzen, *Inscr. lat.*, No. 6913; Perrot, *De Gal. prov. rom.*, p. 102.
6. For Inconium, see *Corpus inscr. gr.*, No. 3993, iii. Nos. 600 a, 604, 655, 667, 668, 669, 675, 678, 680, 685, 688, 699, 699 a, 700, and the notes of Waddington; Wagener, *Inscr. d'As. Min.*, p. 3, et seq. For Laodicea on the Lycus, Waddington *Voy. en As. Min. au point de vue numismatique*, p. 26, et seq. For Aphrodisias and Sebastopolis, *ibid.* p. 43, et seq., 54, 55. For Mylasia, Le Bas, iii. Nos. 340, et seq. For the religion of the Solymæans; *Corpus inscr. gr.*, No. 4366 k and q; Waddington on No. 1202 of Le Bas (iii.). For Lycia, *Corpus*, Nos. 4303 i and k; Le Bas, iii. 1229. For Pisidia, Waddington, on Nos. 1209, 1210 of Le Bas (iii.); *Voy. numismatique*, p. 99, 105, 107, 140, 141. The two Comanas and Pessinonte kept all their sacerdotal organization.
7. Lucian, *Alexander seu pseudomantis* (a work which is not pure romance; cf. Athénagoras, *Leg.*, 26, and the money of Abonoticus); *De morte Peregrini* (the same observation; cf. Athénagoras, l. c.; Tatian, *adv. Græc.*, 25; Aulu-Gelle, *Noct. att.*, xii. 11; Philostratus, *Vies des Soph.*, II. i. 33; Eus., *Chron.* ad olymp. 236.)
8. See his *Oniromanticæ*.
9. See his life, in the edition of his works (Dindorf), iii. p. cxvi. 236, etc.; *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* (new series), xxvi. 1st part, p. 203, et seq. Galian even, a mind so drilled, believes in the dreams of Esculapius (see the treatise *Diagnostic des Maladies par le moyen des songes*, and in several places in his writings, Opp. vol. ii. p. 29; x. 971; xi. 314; xv. 441, et seq.; xvii. 214, et seq.). Strabo, so prudent, believes in the wonders of the temples (XIII. iv. 14, for example).
10. Lucian, *Alexander seu pseudom.*, § 25, 44, 47.
11. Recall the *cataphryges*, the montanisme, Priscilla de Pepuze.
12. For example, in the two Comanas, at Pessinonte, at Olba, cf. Strabo, XII. ii. 5, 6; Waddington, *Mél. de num.*, 2d series, p. 121, et seq.

13. Tac., *Ann.*, iv. 55, 56; Dio Cassius, xli. 20; inscription to the divinity of Nero while living, *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 2942 d (suppl.), Comp. Le Bas, iii. 1480; Waddington, *Mél de num.*, 2d series, p. 133, et seq.; the same, *Voy. en Asie Min. au point de vue numism.*, p. 6, 9, 10, 33, 34, 35, 36, 75, 149, 150. The inscriptions in honor of the Roman functionaries are numerous. See especially *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3524, 3532, 3548.
14. Φιλόχαιος *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 2748, 2975, etc.
15. Aelius Aristides, orat. XLII. édit. Dindorf; Wagner *Inscr. d'As. Min.* p. 36, et seq.; Waddington, in the *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, vol. xxvi. 1st part, p. 252, et seq.
16. Testament of Attalus, inscription of Ancyra, etc.
17. Especially of P. Servilius, of Pompey. of Quirinius. Strabo. XII. vi. 5; XIV. iii. 3; V. 2. 7; inscription of Quirinius, in Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi Aug.*, p. 118, et seq.; Cicero, letters from Cilicia; Tacitus, *Ann.*, iii. 48; vi. 41; xii. 55.
18. In Paphlagonia, for instance, note Germanicopolis, Neoclandiopolis, Pompeiopolis, Adrianopolis, Antinoopolis.
19. Dion Cassius, ix. 17.
20. See p. 67, cf., Le Bas, *Inscr.*, iii. Nos. 848, 857, 859, 1385 bis., and the notes of Waddington.
21. Jos. Ant., XIV. x. 22, 23; Strabo, XVII. iii. 24; Tacitus, *Ann.*, iv. 55.
22. Σεβαστῇ Πρόνοια (Le Bas, *Inscr.*, iii. 858) compare the coins and Le Bas, iii. 1245. This formula, besides, does not belong to Asia Minor, cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 313.
23. Eckhel, D. n. v. vi. p. 101; Tacitus, *Ann.*, iv. 37, 55, 56; vi. 15. Dion Cassius, LI. 20; *Corpus inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3524, 3990 c, 4016, 4017, 4031, 4238, 4240 d, 4247, 4266, 4363, 4379, c, e, f, h, i, k; Le Bas, *Inscr.* iii. Nos. 621, 627, 857-859, 1611; Waddington, *Explic. des Inscr.* of Le Bas, p. 207, 208, 238, 239, 376; Perrot, *De Gal. prov. rom.*, p. 129. At Rome, there was no temple of this kind. They made a difference between Italy and the provinces for the worship of the Emperor.
24. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, 2943, 4366 b.
25. Comp. Tac., *Ann.*, iv. 55, 56.
26. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 3461; Dio Chrys., *Orat.*, xxxv. p. 497 (Emperius); Mionnet, Phrygia, suppl., vii., p. 564; Le Bas, *Inscr.*, iii. No. 626, 653, 885, and the explanations of Waddington; Perrot, *op.cit.*, p. 129, 150, et seq.; *Expl. de la Gal.*, p. 199, et seq.
27. Augusteum of Ancyra and Apollonius of Pisidia. There were analogues of them in Pergamus, in Nicomédia, and doubtless in other cities. They knew nothing of them outside of Asia Minor.
28. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 4085. Cf. Perrot, *De Gal. prov. rom.*, p. 75.

29. Nineveh.
30. Tacitus, *Ann.*, iii. 62; *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 2748.
31. Perrot, *Exploration de la Gal.*, p. 31, 32, 124. Le Bas, Nos. 1021, 1033, 1034 a, 1039, 1042, 1044, 1137, 1205, 1205, 1219, 1227, 1245, 1253, 1254.
32. Pieces quoted by Joseph., *Ant.* XIV. x. 11, et seq.; XVI. vi. 2 (suspected), 4, 6, 7, and which have here their convincing power, independently of their authenticity; Cic., *Pro. Flacco*, 28, Philo. *Leg. ad Caium*, § 36, 40; Acts ii. 9, 10; I. Petri, i. 1.
33. Strabo, XIV. iv. 2; Pomp. Mela., i. 14; Texier, *Asie Min.*, p. 709.
34. There remain beautiful ruins of them. See Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xix. p. 585, et seq., *Descr.*, iii. p. 211, et seq., and *Arch. byz.*, p. 31, et seq.
35. Scylax, *Périp.*, 100; Strabo, l. c.; Callimachus, *Hymne à Artémis*, v. 187; Cicero, *In Verr.*, II. i. 20; Waddington, *Voy. en Asie Mineure au point de vue numismatique*, p. 92, et seq., 142; *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 4342; Le Bas, *Inscr.*, iii. 1373.
36. Waddington, l. c.; et *Mel. de Num. et de Phil.*, p. 57.
37. Waddington, *Mel. de Num. et de Phil.*, p. 58.
38. See the strange form of these proper names, *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 4401, et seq.
39. Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38, 39.
40. Texier, *Asie Mineure*, p. 713, et seq.; Waddington, *Voy. Num.*, p. 99, 100.
41. Cicero, letters from his proconsulate of Cilicia. Cf. Dion Cassius, lx. 17. The Homonades inhabited these latitudes, Strabo, XII. vi. vii. 51; XIV. v. 1, 24. See p. 60 and p. 67. The principal site, however, seemed to be further east.
42. See Laborde, *Voy. de la Syrie*, p. 107, et seq., pl., xxx., lix., lx., lxi., lxii.; W. J. Hamilton, "Researches in Asia Minor;" i. 477, et seq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xix. p. 477, et seq. Conybeare and Howson, *the Life of St. Paul*, i. p. 175, et seq. Cf. Pliny, v. 23. ¹
43. Acts xiii. 43, 50.
44. Acts xiv. 1-5.
45. Acts xiii. 44; xiv. 1.
46. Acts xv. 1, 3.
47. In fact, this city was situated in Phrygia (Strabo, XII. vii. 14). It had such traditions (Waddington, on No. 668 of the third volume of the Inscriptions of Le Bas).
48. Considerable ruins near the town of Jalovatch, Arundell, *Discoveries in Asia Minor*, i. 265, et seq. W. J. Hamilton, *Researches in Asia Minor*, i., p. 474, et seq. Laborde, *Voy. de l'Asie Mineure*, p. 113, et seq., pl. xxx., lxii.
49. This is proved by its coins.

50. Strabo, XII. viii. 14; Pliny, v. 24; Etienne de Byz., at this word; Eckhel, iii. p. 18, 19; *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 1586, 2811 b; Digest, L. xv. 8. Cf. *Ann. del. Institut. archéol. de Rome*, xix. p. 147. The Latin inscriptions are numerous (Le Bas, and Waddington, *Inscr.* iii. Nos. 1189-1891, 1815, et seq.) The coins are Latin.
51. Strabo, XII. vii. 14 (comp. XII. iii. 31); Hamilton, l. c., Cf. Waddington, *Expl. des Inscript.* of Le Bas, iii. p. 215, 216. The medals prove, however, that the religion of Antioch lasted till the time of Gordian.
52. Paul himself was conscious of having changed in this respect, II. Cor. v. 16; Gal. v. 11; Phil. iii. 13; Eph. iv. 13, 14; I. Cor. ii. entire; iii. 1; ix. 20.
53. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 3980. This formula is peculiar to Phrygia. Comp. p. 319; comp. also, for the contrast with Pisidia, No. 4380 r, s, t. See Le Bas, iii. No. 1231.
54. Acts xiii. 14, et seq.; II. Tim. iii. 11.
55. Acts xiii. 51, cf.; Matt. x. 14; Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5; *Acts* xviii. 6.
56. Laborde, *Voy. de l'Asie Min.* p. 115, et seq., Sperling, in the *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde*, 1864, p. 10, et seq.
57. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3993, 4385.
58. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3995 b, 4389.
59. Note the barbarous form of the proper names, *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 3987, et seq.
60. Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.*, iii. p. 524. Compare the medals of Apamée Kibotos, with the biblical myths of Noah and Enoch.
61. Strabo, XII. vi. 1.
62. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3991, 3993 (see the addenda); Le Bas, iii. 1385 bis. Eckhel, D, n, v. iii. 31-33, Iconium (Konieh) still of importance.
63. On the existence of the Jews in these parts of Asia, see *Corp. inscr. gr.*, 4129, and perhaps 4087 (corrected by Perrot, *Exploration de la Galatie*, p. 207, et seq.); Acts xvi. 3; I. Peter i. 1; the epistle to the Galatians, supposing the Jews among the converted; ii. 15; iii. 2, 7, 8, 13, 23, 24, 28; iv. 3, 21, 31.
64. Acts xiv. 3.
65. Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 17.
66. See *Acta apost. apocr.*, de Tischendorf, p. 40, et seq.
67. Sperling, in the journal cited, p. 23, 24.
68. Gal. ii. 15; iii. 2, 7, 8, 13, 23, 24, 28; iv. 3, 21.
69. Gal. iv. 8; v. 2; vi. 12. On the application here made of the epistle to the Galatians, see p. 48-51.
70. Gal. v. 21.
71. Gal. iii. 2-5.
72. Acts xiv., et seq.; II. Tim. iii. 11.

73. "Montagne noire." The ancient name is unknown.
74. Strabo, XII. vi. 1; Hamilton, *Res.*, ii. 310, et seq.; Laborde, *Voy. de l'Asie Min.*, p. 19, et seq. 122; Texier, *Asie Min.*, p. 651, et seq., Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 199, et seq.
75. Lystra is probably Madenschér or Binbir-kilissé, in the Karadagh (Hamilton, ii. 316, et seq., and its inscription No. 423; com. Laborde, p. 120, et seq.; Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 200, et seq., 211, 212, 281, et seq.; see, however, Texier, *Descr. de l'Asie Min.*, 132, 133.). We must not confound Lystra with Illistra, now *Ilisra* (*Synecdème d'Hieroclès*, p. 675, Wesseling; *Notitiæ episcop.*, p. 70, 115, 175, 158, 177, 193, 194, 212, 213, 254, 255, Parthney; Bolotoff and Kiepert's charts, after Tchihatchef; Texier, l. c.; Hamilton, ii. 325). Derbe may be Divle, in a valley at the base of the Taurus, position confirmed by Strabo, c. XII. vi. 2 and 3) and by *Etienne de Byzance* (at the word *Δέρβη*). Cf. Texier, *Asie Min.*, p. 658, Divle, in fact, has furnished two inscriptions (*Corpus inscr. gr.*, 4009 c², 4009 c³; Le Bas, iii, 1807, 1808). However, as *Etienne de Byzance* places near Derbe a *λιμὴν* (read *λίμνη*). We can also identify Derbe with the ruins of an ancient city that Hamilton found near lake Ak-Ghieul (see Kiepert's map of Asia Minor; Hamilton, ii. p. 313, 319, et seq., and its inscription, No. 421). So that Lystra and Derbe would be about eight leagues apart and in the same geographical canton. The manner in which these two cities are usually coupled (Acts xiv. 6; xvi. 1) proves that they were neighbors. At all events, the position of the two localities is determined by Acts xiv. 21; xvi. 1, 2, and we can only hesitate for them between the different traces of cities which mark the route from Karadagh to the Ak-Ghieul. Derbe was considered by ancient geographers as part of Isauria. The boundaries of Isauria and Lycaonia were very indefinite at the Roman epoch. Cf. Strabo, xii. vi. 21; Pliny, v. 23, 25.
76. The Isaurians, the Clites, the Homonades, Strabo, XII. vi. 2-5; Tacitus, *Ann.*, iii. 48; vi. 41; xii. 55. The Isaurians kept their place until the middle age. They were never quite subdued, except by the Sedjoukides, Trebellius Pollion, the *thirty tyrants*, 25; Vopiscus, *Probus*, 19; Ammian, Marcellin., xiv. 2; xxvii. 9; John Chrysostom, *Epist.* p. 522, 570, 593, 596, et seq.; 599, 606, 630, 631, 633, et seq.; 656, 661, 673, 676, 679, 682, 683, 708 (edit. Montfaucon).
77. This is the impression of Cicero, who encamped fifteen days near Derbe. He speaks of this whole country with profound disdain (Letters *ad Fam.* and *ad Att.*, dated from Cilicia).
78. Acts xiv. 11; *Etienne de Byz.*, at the word *Δέρβη* or *Δελβεΐα*.
79. Results from Acts xiv. 19 (Greek text). There were some, however, Acts xvi. 3.

80. Claudiopoliſ-Mount on the Calycadnus (Hierocles, *Smynecdèe*, p. 709, Wess; *Notitiæ episc.*, p. 85, 129, 224, edit. Parthey); Claudiconium, etc., Le Bas, iii. 1385 *bis*.
81. From Iconia to Lystra (if Lystra is Madenscher), the route is thirteen hours, Laborde, p. 119.
82. Eunape, *Vies des Sophistes*, p. 454, 500 (edit. Didot).
83. Ovid, *Metam.*, iii. 621-726.
84. Ζεύε πρόπυλοſ. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 2963 c.
85. Πυλῶνας can scarcely refer to anything but the temple. *Αχού-σαντες*, supposes also that the scene occurred far from where Paul was. Finally, the idea of coming to make a sacrifice at the door of Paul's house is exaggerated, and contrary to ancient customs. We know that sacrifices were made before the Temple and not within.
86. Acts xiv. 15-17.
87. This feminine name is found at Cyprus, v. Pape, S. h. v.
88. II. Tim. i. 5. III. 15. This epistle is apocryphal, but it is not probable that the names of these two women were invented.
89. Acts xvi. 1. See p. 76.
90. Acts xvi. 3.
91. Acts xiv. 6, et seq.; II. Tim. iii. 11. Comp. II. Cor. xi. 25.
92. See Perrot, *De Gal. prov. rom.*, p. 33, et seq.; *Explor. de la Gal.*, p. 194, et seq.; Waddington, *Explic. des Inscr.* of Le Bas, iii., p. 337, 349; Robiou, *Hist. des Gaulois d'Orient*, p. 259, et seq., and the chart.
93. Appian, *Bell. civ.* v. 75.
94. Dion Cassius xlix. 32.
95. Dion Cassius LI. 2.
96. Strabo XII. v. 4; vi. 1, 3, 4; vii. 3; XIV. v. 6.
97. Strabo XII. v. 1; vi. 5; vii. 3, XVIII. iii. 25; Dion Cassius LIII. 26.
98. Strabo XIV. v. 6.
99. Dion Cassius LIII. 26.
100. Dion Cassius LIII. 26; Cf. Pliny, H. N. V. 25, 42.
101. Strabo XII. vi. 5, Cf. Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi. Aug.* p. vii.
102. Pliny v. 23; Le Bas *Inscr.* III. 1385 *bis*, and the note of Waddington. It was part of the kingdom of Amyntas; but after the death of Amyntas, it was neither made free nor united to any other province.
103. Henzen, No. 6912. Cf. Perrot, *De Gal. prov. rom.* p. 39, et seq., 46, et seq.; Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi. Aug.* p. vii. For Apollonia, however, see Le Bas iii. No. 1192.
104. Thus the city of Iconium honors as its benefactor a procurator of Galatia (*Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 3991). Cf. Le Bas iii. 1385 *bis*. Pliny (H. N. V. 42) indicates the Lystreni among the populations of Galatia. What he says of the borders of Galatia (v. 25 and 42) is

confused, but does not essentially contradict our thesis. Ptolemy (V. iv. 1, 10, 11,) understands Galatia as Strabo, Cf. Henzen, No. 6940; Le Bas iii. 1798; Capitolin, *Maximin et Balbin*, 7; I. *Petri*. i. 1, the inscriptions which, like those of Henzen 6912, 6913; Marini, *Atti*, p. 766; Le Bas iii. 176, 627, 1816; Perrot *De Gal.* p. 102, enumerate with Galatia its annexed provinces, prove only that the old names still existed. Besides, these agglomerations of provinces often varied, especially on the part of Vespasian. Cf. Le Bas and Waddington iii. 1480; Perrot, *De Gal.* p. 134-136.

105. *Corp. inscr. gr.* 4011, 4020, 4030, 4032, 5896; Henzen, 6912, 6013; Marini, *Atti*, p. 766; Perrot, *De Gal.* p. 102; Eckhel, *D. n. v.* III. 177, 178.
106. Strabo XII. iv. 6; XVII. iii. 25. The same policy is plain in Gaul. But below the province, where the boundary is uncertain, the old divisions of the canton and the city are preserved.
107. *Asia, Macedonia, Achaïa* denoted for him the provinces of these names, and not the countries formerly so called.
108. This explains that unique peculiarity of the Epistle to the Galatians, that it is not addressed to any particular church. It also explains one of the noticeable peculiarities in St. Paul's life. The Epistle to the Galatians supposes that Paul had made a long sojourn among those to whom this letter is addressed, — that his connection with them was intimate, at least as much so as with the Corinthians and Thessalonians. But Acts makes no mention of the evangelization of Galatia strictly speaking. In his second voyage, Paul traverses "the region of Galatia" (Acts xvi. 6). We see that we can suppose at this time but a very short delay. It is in no wise probable that the profound evangelization, which the Epistle to the Galatians assumes, took place in so rapid a voyage. On the contrary, what strikes us in the first mission is its long duration, compared with the little that was done, and with results which would have been unimportant, if the founding of the churches of Galatia had not been added to them. In placing here the evangelization of the Galatians, we give a sort of weight necessary to the equilibrium of the life of St. Paul. Comparing Acts xvi. 6 with Acts xviii. 23, we are satisfied that for the author of the Acts, *Γαλατική χώρα* signifies the Roman province of Galatia, and that the part he wishes to designate at these two places is Lycaonia. Do not object that in relating, in the fourteenth chapter, the evangelization of Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, the author of the Acts does not use the name of Galatia. He proceeds there in detail; while in Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23, he speaks in general terms. The proof is that in one case he changes the order of *Φρυγία* and of *Γαλατική χώρα*. According to the idea of the author of the Acts, these two voyages

through Asia Minor are voyages of confirmation, and not conversion (Acts xv. 36, 41; xvi. 5, 6; xviii. 23). Finally, in one of these voyages, the object of St. Paul being Troas, and in the other Ephesus, the itinerary of Acts xvi. 6 and of Acts xviii. 23 is inconceivable if *Ἰαλαττικὴ χώρα* is Galatia proper. Why this strange turning aside towards the north, particularly if we consider how difficult the central *steppe* is to traverse? There was probably at that epoch no route from Iconium to Ancyra (Perrot *De Gal.*, p. 102, 103). How improbable it is also, that the Hierosolymite emissaries (Gal. i. 7) should have made such a journey. Let us add, that the mention of Barnabas in the epistle to the Galatians leads to the belief that the Galatians knew him; which reconveys the evangelization of the Galatians to the first mission.

109. Gal. iv. 14, 15, etc.

110. Gal. iv. 13, 14.

111. Gal. iii. 4.

112. Acts xvi. 1, 2; xx. 4.

113. Acts xiv. 25. There were Jews in Pamphylia, Philo., *Leg. ad Caium*, § 36; Acts ii. 10.

114. Now *Adalia*.

CHAPTER III.

1. Jean Malala, p. 242 (edit. of Bonn). See *Les Apôtres*, p. 226, 227.
2. Acts xiv. 27, 28.
3. II. Cor. vii. 23.
4. Gal. ii. 1, 3; Tit. i. 4.
5. Acts v. 34; xv. 5; xxi. 20; xxiii. 9, et seq.
6. Acts iv. 5, 6; xxiii. 6, et seq.
7. We feel that it is the opinion of Josephus (*Ant.* XX. ii. 5; *Vita*, 23) and of the Jew of whom Strabo tells us, XVI. ii. 35-37.
8. Talm. de Bab., *Schabbath*, 31 a.
9. Jos. *Ant.* XX. ii. 5. See *Les Apôtres*, p. 256.
10. Jos. *Ant.* XVI. vii. 6; XX. vii. 1, 3. Cf. *Masseket Gèrim*, édit. Kirchheim, c. i.
11. Suetonius, *Domitian*, 12.
12. See p. 192, 200, 201.
13. Josephus *Vita*, 23.
14. See Acts x. 13-15.
15. Jacob Bernays *Ueber das phokylideische Gedicht*, Berlin, 1856.
16. Among the works of Josephus.

17. *Pirke Aboth*. i. 12; Talm. of Bab., *Schabbath*, 31 a.
18. *Carmina Sibyll.* III. 213, et seq. Cf. Strabo XVI. ii. 35-37. It is remarkable that the Pseudo-Phocylides, the Pseudo-Heraclitus, the false sibyl, do not hesitate sometimes to use heathen expressions.
19. Tac. *Hist.* V. 5. Cf. Strabo XVI. ii. 37.
20. Notice the atrocious punishment which they pretended was inflicted on Apion because he mocked at the circumcision. Josephus, *Contre Ap.* II. 13.
21. I. Macch. i. 15; I. Cor. vii. 18; Jos. Ant. XII. v. 1; Martial VII. xxix. (xxx.) 5; Talm. of Bab., *Jebamoth*, 72 a; Talm. of Jer., *Jebamoth*, viii. 1; Buxtorf. *Lex. chald. talm. rabb.* at the word בִּשְׁבַּע.
22. *De medic.* VII. 25. Cf. Dioscorides iv. 157; Epiphanes, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, 16.
23. Josephus B. J. II. xx. 2. Cf. Derenbourg, *Palестine d'après les Thalmuds*, I. p. 223, notes, and in *Forschungen der wisstalm. Vereins*, No. 14, 1867 (*Beilage zu Ben Chananja*, No. 6) p. 190; Acts xiii. 50; xvi. 1.
24. Gen. xxxiv. 14, et seq.; Ex. xxxiv. 16; Num. xxv.; Deut. vii. 3, et seq.; I Kings xi. 1, et seq.; Esdras x; Nehe. xiii. 23, et seq.; Talm. of Jer. *Megilla* iv. 10.
25. Mischna *Sanhedrin*, ix. 6. Cf. Numbers xxv. 13.
26. Comp. I. Cor. vii.
27. I. Cor. x. 25, et seq.; Tac. *Hist.* v. 5.
28. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium* § 45; Strabo XVI. ii. 37.
29. Ex. xxxiv. 15; Mischna *Aboda zara* ii. 3.
30. Theophrastes *Caract.* ix; Servius *ad Æneid.* VIII. 183.
31. I. Cor. viii. 4, et seq.; x. 25, et seq.
32. I will quote the example of the *métualis* of Syria, reduced to the darkest fanaticism by the obligation they are under to break all their vessels and to overthrow their houses as soon as a Christian has touched them.
33. That seems to result from II. Cor. v. 16; Gal. v. 11, observing the force of ἐτι.
34. Acts xv. 5; xxi. 20.
35. Acts xv. 24. The care with which they insist upon this point proves that at least they were strongly suspected of having one.
36. Acts xv. 1, 2.
37. Gal. ii. 1. It seems more natural to say "fourteen" years. But if we do not count the fourteen years to date from the time of the conversion (cf. *ibid.* i. 17, 18), we fall into almost insurmountable chronological difficulties.
38. Comp. Acts xxvi. 16, etc.
39. Gal. ii. 2.

40. Gal. ii. 1-3.
41. Now *Lattakie*.
42. Acts xv. 2, 22, 23; xxi. 18.
43. Acts xv. 4, 22.
44. Acts xv. 22.
45. Gal. ii. 9; Clem. Rom. *Epist.* I. ad Cor. 5.
46. It is possible this name was given him after his death, by allusion to Isaiah iii. 10, as presented by the Septuagint, and to his name of *Obliam*. Hegesippus indicates the comparison, and, putting in close connection his names of Δίκαιος and of Ωβλίας, adds ὡς οἱ προφήται δηλοῦσι περὶ αὐτοῦ.
47. Jos. *Ant.* XX. ix. 1.
48. This seems to contradict I. Cor. ix. 5, and shows that this picture preserved by Hegesippus, and by Saint Epiphanius, is in part composed of traits *a priori*.
49. Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* II. 23; Eusebius H. E. II. 1; Epiph., *Hær.* lxxxiii. 7, 13, 14; Saint Jerome *De viris ill.* 2; *Comm. in Gal.* i. 19; *Adv. Jovin.* I. Col. 182 (Martianay); Pseudo-Abdias, *Hist. Apost.* vi. 5. Cf. the gospel of the Nazarenes in St. Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 2. We perceive in these curious passages the echo, and often textual extracts of a Judean-Christian legend, seeking to exaggerate the rôle of James, and to transform him into a great Jewish priest. Besides, the passage Acts xxi. 23, et seq., shows James's taste for vows and exterior ceremonies. The epistle which is attributed to him shows also a certain ascetic character.
50. Daniel i. 8, 12; Tobias i. 12, et seq.; Josephus *Vita.* 2, 3. See especially that which relates to the "Essenes" and "Therapeutics," in Philo and Josephus, and the reflections of Eusebius on the subject, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17.
51. Epiph., *Hær.* xxx. 15, 16; Homil. pseudo-clem. viii. 15; xii. 1, 6; xiv. 1; xv. 6. Cf. Rom. ch. xiv.; Clement of Alexandria *Pædag.* ii. 1.
52. Talm. of Jer. *Nazir.* i. 6.
53. Mischna *Nazir.* iii. 6.; vi. 11; Jos. B. J. II. xv. 1.
54. Epiph., *Hær.* lxxviii. 14.
55. Or perhaps "bond of the people" (חֵבֶל לְעָם). It is possible this title expressed originally his place in Christian society. Then the Judean-Christian legend may have lent James a rôle altogether in the Jewish nation.
56. Hegesippus *loc. cit.*; Epiph., *Hær.* lxxviii. 14.
57. Hegesippus *loc. cit.* Josephus, *Ant.* XX. ix. 1, a passage which seems well authenticated. What Origen adds to it (*comm. in Matt.* vol. X. § 17, and *Contre Celse* I. § 47; II. § 13), Eusebius (H. E. ii. 23; Dem. cv. iii. 23), Saint Jerome *De viris illustr.* 2; *Adv. Jovin.* l. c.) on the contrary, is an error of Origen, or an interpolation.

58. See "The Life of Jesus."
59. Gal. ii. 6.
60. Jude 1, and all the epistle. Cf. Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3.
61. The history of this episode is known to us by two recitals, Acts xv. and Gal. ii. These two recitals offer very grave differences. Naturally, for the correctness of material facts, that of Paul is to be preferred. The author of the Acts writes under a sudden, strong, political prejudice. He is, in doctrine, of the party favorable to the heathens; but in the question of persons he is much milder than Paul. He wished to efface all trace of the dissensions which existed; finally, he wished to give a foundation to the theory which tended to prevail over power of the church-party. Thus he lends to the interview an air of council, which it had not at this stage, and to Paul a docility against which he protests (Comp. Acts xv. 41, xvi. 4, with Gal. ch. i. and ii.). On the other hand, Paul is pre-occupied with two fixed ideas: in the first place, to keep the authority of the heathen churches out of the contest; secondly, to establish that he had neither received nor learned anything of the apostles. But the single fact of having come to Jerusalem was a recognition of the authority of the church of Jerusalem. The two recitals require to be combined, modified, and reconciled.
62. Acts xv. 4, 14-18.
63. Gal. i. 23, 24.
64. Acts xv. 7, et seq.
65. Acts xv. 12.
66. Gal. ii. 2, et seq. Paul's recital does not exclude the possibility of assemblies, but it excludes the idea that the matter was principally discussed in an assembly, or settled by an assembly.
67. Gal. ii. 7-9; II. Cor. x. 13-16; Rom. xi. 13; xv. 14-16.
68. Acts xxi. 18, et seq.; Gal. ii. 12.
69. Hegesippus in *Eus. H. E.* ii. 23.
70. These are doubtless the *παρεῖδαντοι ψευδάδελφοι* of Gal. ii. 4.
71. The Acts assert the contrary. But Gal. ii. 12 proves that he did not modify his opinion.
72. Acts xv. 13-21.
73. This is the meaning of verse xv. 21. The Pharisees did not consider the law as applying to the whole human race. It seemed essential to them that there should always be a holy tribe, who observed and offered a living realization of the revealed ideal.
74. Comp. Acts xxi. 20, et seq.
75. Comp. Acts xxi. 20-25.
76. Gal. ii. 4.
77. Gal. ii. 3-5. The meaning is, "If Titus was circumcised, it is not that he was forced to it. It was because of the false brethren, to

whom we might yield a moment, but not submit ourselves in principle." The opposition of *πρὸς ὧραν* and of *διαμεῖνῃ* confirms our explanation. If it is not adopted, verse 5 is meaningless. Cf. Tertullian, *Contre Marcion*, v. 3. Paul's conduct in this circumstance, if it is what we suppose, answers well to Acts xvi. 3; xxi. 20, et seq., to I. Cor. ix. 20, et seq., and to Rom. xiv., xv., 1, et seq.

78. I. Cor. ix. 20.

79. See especially his response in that which concerns the meats sacrificed to idols, I. Cor. viii. 4, et seq.; x. 19, et seq.

80. Acts xv. 28, et seq. Comp. Acts xxi. 25; Apoc. ii. 14, 20; Pseudo-Phocylides, verse 175, et seq.; Pseudo-Heraclitus, 7th letter (in a Jewish or Christian hand), line 85 (edition of Bernays); Pseudo-Clement, *Homil.* vii. 4, 8; *Recogn.* I. 30; IV. 36; VI. 10; IX. 29; *Constit. apost.* VI. 12; *Canones apost.* canon 63 (Lagarde); letters from the churches of Lyons and Vienna, in Eusebius *H. E.* v. 1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9; Minutius Felix, 30. On the meaning of the word *πορνεία*, comp. I. Cor. v. 1, and Levit. xviii. This word can only signify intermarriage; cf. I. Cor. vii. The prohibition to eat blood soon fell into disuse among the Latins (St. Aug., *Contra Faustum* xxxii. 13). But it was preserved among the Greeks (*conc.* of Gangres, canon 18; *Novelles de Leon*, the Philosopher, const. 58; Harmenopulus *Epitome canonum*, § V., tit. V., No. 14, p. 65, 66 (Freher); Cotelier, *Eccl. græcæ monum.*, tit. III., p. 504, 505, 668, 669; *De Sto. Theodoro*, vers. 253, in Wernsdorf, *Manuelis Philæ carmina græca*, p. 46.

81. Talm. of Bab. *Sanhedrin* 56 b.

82. Gen. ix. 4; Levit. xvii. 14; Book of Jubilees c. 7 (Ewald *Jahrb.*, years 2 and 3).

83. Origen, *Contre Celse*, viii. 30.

84. Poëma *ρουνετιχόν*, ver. 139, 145, 147, 148 (Bernays, *Ueber das phokyl. Gedicht*). The apocryphal correspondence of Heraclitus, composed chiefly in the first century of our era, shows at times an analogous tendency. Cf. J. Bernays, *Die heraklitischen Briefe* (Berlin, 1869), p. 26, et seq.; 68, 72, et seq.

85. Poëma *ρουνετιχόν*, verse 175, et suiv.

86. Comp. especially Acts xv. 20 and I. Cor. viii., x. It is impossible to admit the textual authenticity of the ordinance cited Acts xv. 23-29; first, because St. Paul (Gal. ii.) would have appealed to such an ordinance had it existed; second, because Gal. ii., et seq., would have been void of meaning if there had been such an ordinance; third, because the recital (Acts xxi. 18, et seq., and even xvi. 3) is no longer explained by this hypothesis; fourth, because the doctrine of Paul on sacrificed meats (I. Cor. viii., x.) contradicts the ordinance; fifth,

because the Judean-Christian party always denied the legitimacy of all repeal of a part of the law, a thing that can not be imagined, if the question had been canonically regulated by such persons as James and Peter, of whom the Judean-Christian party proclaimed the supreme authority.

87. Gal. ii. 2, 6, et seq. Cf. the *Κήρυγμα Παύλου*, cited by the author of "*De non iterando baptismo*," sequel to the works of St. Cyprian, edit. Rigault, Paris, 1648, append. p. 139.
88. Gal. ii. 7-9. Probably Paul's memory conformed here to the interests of his thesis, and induced him to some exaggeration.
89. Gal. ii. 2.
90. Acts xv. 22, et seq.

CHAPTER IV.

1. Josephus, *Contre Apion*, ii. 39.
2. Acts, xiii. 52, etc.
3. Urbem. . . quo cuncta undique atrocita aut pudenda confluent celebranturque. Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44.
4. The epigraphy of the city of Rome gave evidence of it; still more the literature.
5. For the Jews, see Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 63; *Dissert. arch.*, ii. p. 176, 177, etc. Only a quarter of the Jewish inscriptions of Rome is in Latin. For the Christians, see de Rossi *Inscr. Christ. urbes Romæ*, i. Jews and Christians often wrote Latin in Greek characters. Garrucci, *Cim.* p. 67, and *Dissert.* ii. p. 164, 176, 180, 181, 183, 184.
6. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25; Acts, xviii. 2. The precautionary measures which Claudius took against the Jews, after Dion Cassius (LX. 6,) seem to have nothing in common with the fact reported by Suetonius, They seem to relate to an earlier date.
7. This name is quite common, especially among slaves or affranchised. Orrelli, 2414, etc. Cic. *Epist. fam.* ii. 8. See Van Dale, *De orac.* p. 604, 605 (2d edit.). It was used especially among the Jews; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 2114, *b. b.*; Lévy, *Epigr. Beitr.* p. 301, 313; *Ant. du Bosph. Cimm.* inscr. No. 22; *Mel. greco-rom.* of the Acad. of St. Petersburg, i. p. 98. Cf. Martial, VII. liv; de Rossi, *Roma sott.* I. tav. xxi. No. 4.
8. That which makes this hypothesis almost a certainty is the similitude of Acts xviii. 2, and Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44. Tacitus, in fact, supposes that the Christians were repressed before Nero. It is true that Tac-

tus (*ibid*) and Suetonius himself, elsewhere (*Nero*, 16) speak more accurately of the Christians. But we may suppose that Suetonius copies, in the life of Claudius, an account or report of the police of the time.

9. The word *χριστιανός*, previously made (see *les Apôtres*, p. 234), proves that, from this epoch, the most common name to designate Jesus was *Χριστός*. Cf. Pliny *Epist.* x. 97. St. Paul, in his epistles, generally writes the two names. Sometimes he uses only one of them.
10. See *les Apôtres*, p. 234, 235.
11. The confusion of the two names is explained, moreover, by the iotacist pronunciation of *χρηστός*. This confusion was frequent. See Tertullian, *Apol.* 3, Lactantius *Instit.* IV. vii. 5. Among the inscriptions prior to Constantine, where the name of the Christians is found, three out of four bear *χρηστιανοί*. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2883*d*, 3857*g*, 3857*p*). The substitution of the *e* for the *i* is, moreover, a very common feature of Roman orthography. Quintilian I. iv. 7; vii. 22. Orosius (vii. 6) read *Christus* in the passage of Suetonius.
12. Com. Acts xvi. 1.
13. Suetonius does not say in what year this took place. Orosius assigns the 9th of the reign of Claudius (49. 50). *Hist.* vii. 6. But Orosius appeals to the authority of Josephus for it, in works where we find nothing about this fact. The verse (Acts xviii. 2) clearly establishes that at the time of the passage of Paul to Corinth (52) the edict was recent.
14. Philo. *Leg. ad Caium*, § 23; Martial, I. XLII. (xxxv.) 3. The Jews continued to inhabit the *Transtévère* until the fifteenth or sixteenth century (Bosio, *Roma sott.* lv. II. ch. xxiii; cf. *Corp.* No. 9907). It is certain, however, that, under the emperors, they inhabited many other places, especially the Field of Mars (*Corp.* Nos. 9905, 9906; Orelli, 2522; Garrucci, *Dissert. arch.* ii. p. 163), the outside of the Capena gate (Juv. Sat. iii. 11. et seq.; Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 4; peculiar archaeological information), the isle of the Tiber, and the mendicant's bridge (Juv. iv. 116; v. 8; xiv. 134; Martial, X. v. 3), and perhaps the Subura (*Corp.* No. 6447).
15. Martial, I. xlii. 3; VI. xciii. 4; Juvenal, xiv. 201, et seq.
16. The principal Jewish cemetery of Rome was found near there by Bosio, in 1602. Bosio, *op. cit.* I. II, ch. xxii.; Aringhi, *Roma. Sott.* vol. I. I. ii. c. 23. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 9901, et seq., inscriptions found mostly in this cemetery, and left in great numbers in the neighborhood. The trace of the catacomb is lost. P. Marchi has sought it in vain. Two Jewish catacombs have since been found at Rome, adjoining each other, on the Appian Way, near Saint Se-

bastian; Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei* (Roma, 1862); *Dissert. arch.* ii. (Roma, 1866) p. 150, et seq., de Rossi. *Bull. di arch. Crist.* 1867, p. 3. 16.

17. *Provinc. Cons.* 5.
18. Philo. l. c.; Tacitus *Ann.* ii. 85. The inscriptions confirm it. Lévy, op. cit. p. 287. Cf. Mommsen, *Inscr. regni Neap.*, No. 6467 (*captiva* is doubtful); de Rossi, *Bull.* 1864, p. 70, 92, 93. Cf. Acts vi. 9.
19. Compare Wescher and Foncart, *Inscr. recueillies à Delphes*, Nos. 57 and 364.
20. Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 28.
21. Jos. *Ant.* XVII, iii. 5; xi. 1; Dion. Cassius, XXXVII. 17; Tacit. *Ann.* II. 85; Suetonius, *Tib.* 36; Mommsen, *Inscr. regni Neap.*, No. 6467. There were in Rome at least four synagogues, two of which bore the names of Augustus and Agrippa (Herod Agrippa?); Corp. *inscr. gr.* 6447, 9902, 9903, 9904, 9905, 9907, 9909; Orelli, 2522; Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 38-40; *Dissert. arch.* ii. p. 161, 162, 163, 165.; de Rossi, *Bull.* 1867, p. 16.
22. Philo. *Leg. ad Caium*, § 23; Juvenal, iii. 14, 296; vi. 542; Martial I. xlii. 3, et seq.; X. iii. 3, 4; XII. lvii. 13, 14, Statius, *silvæ*, I. vi. 72-74. The Jewish burial-places of Rome give evidence of great poverty. Bosia, *Roma sotter.* p. 190, et seq.; Lévy, *Epigraph, Beiträge zur Gesch. de Juden.* p. 283.
23. Nardini, *Roma antica*, iii. p. 328-330 (4^e edit.); Martial, vi. xciii. 4.
24. *Castra lecticariorum*, in the treatise *De regionibus urbis Romæ*, regio xiv; Canina, *Rom. antica*, p. 553, 554. Cf. Forcellini, at the word *lecticarius*. The *Syrus* of the Latin comedies is usually a *lecticarius*.
25. Josephus, *Ant.* XIV. x. 8; Acts, XXVIII. 31.
26. Corp. *inscr. gr.* No. 9908; Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 57, 58.
27. Cf. Hor. *Sat.* I. ix. 69, et seq.; Suetonius, *Aug.* 76; Seneca, *Epist.* xcv. 47; Perse. v. 179, et seq.; Juvenal, xiv. 96, et seq.; Martial, IV. iv. 6. The Jewish epigraphy at Rome attests a population very scrupulous in ceremonies. Lévy, *Epigr. Beytr.* p. 285, et seq. Note the epithets, *φιλεντολος* (Corp. No. 9904; Garrucci, *Dissert.* ii. p. 180. 185, 191, 192), agreeing with Ps. cxix, 48, or any like passage. Comp. Mommsen, *Inscr. regni Neap.* No. 6467 (notwithstanding Garrucci, *cim.* p. 24, 25). The Jews carefully avoided the sepulchral stones bearing *D. M.* They had also in Italy manufactories of lamps for their use (Jewish lamps of the Parent Museum found at Baïa).
28. Corp. *inscr. gr.* Nos. 9902, et seq., Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 35, et seq.; 51, et seq.; 67, et seq.; *Dissert. arch.* ii. p. 161, et seq.; 177, et seq.; 181, et seq.

29. *Corp. inscr. gr.*; Nos. 9904, 9905, 9908, 9909 (cf. Renier *Inscr. de l'Algérie*, No. 3340); Orelli, No. 2522 (cf. Gruter, p. 323); Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 52, 53.
30. Orelli, 2522, 2523; Lévy, p. 285, 311-313; Garrucci, *Dissert. arch.*, ii. p. 166; Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. p. 123, 506, 507.
31. Juvenal, vi. 542, et seq.
32. Hor. *Sat.* I. ix. 71, 72.
33. *Corp. inscr. gr.* 9904, et seq.; Garrucci, *Cimitero*, 31, et seq.; 67, et seq., especially p. 68; *Dissert.* ii., 153, et seq. Remark, especially, the beautiful expressions, φιλοπέννης, φιλολαος (*Corp.* No. 9904; Garrucci, *Diss.* p. 185; cf. II. Macch. xv. 14). *Concresconius*, *Conlaboronius* (Garr. *Diss.* II. p. 160, 161). There is the greatest analogy between the Jewish and Christian epigraphy. It is true that the majority of the inscriptions which we have cited are much later than the reign of Claudius. But the character of the Jewish colonies of Rome could not have changed much.
34. See *les Apôtres*, p. 252. M. Renier thinks that it is of Tiberius Alexander that there is question in Juvenal i. 129, 131; *arabarches* for *alabarches*. *Mem. de l'Acad. des inscr.* vol. XXVI. 1st part., p. 294, et seq.
35. Perse, v. 179, et seq. The question there is of the *hanucca*.
36. Platner and Bunsen. *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.* i. p. 183-185. The excavations recently made near the *agger* of Sevius Tullius evince an agglomeration of population truly incredible.
37. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.
38. Cf. Juvenal, iii. 14; vi. 542.
39. Orosius, vi. 18, 20; small Roman martyrology (edit. Rosweyde) to the 9th of July. See Forcellini, at the word *meritorius*.
40. The Roman tradition intends that the church of St. Mary of Transtevere should have succeeded to the *Taberna*. See Nardini, *Roma antica*, iii. 336, 337; Platner and Bunsen, III. 3d part, p. 659, 660.
41. Lampride, *vie d'Alex. Sév.* 49. Compare Anastasius, the Bibl., *Vite Pontif. rom.* xvii. (edit. of Bianchini), taking notice of the observations of Platner.
42. *Fœtentes judoei*, Am. Mar. XXII. 5.
43. See *les Apôtres*, p. 290, et seq.
44. Juvenal III. 13, Martial IV. iv. 7.
45. See Suet. *Tib.* 36.
46. D. Cass. XXXVII. 17. Comp. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 52, *Hist.* I. 22.
47. It is the date of the epistle to the Romans. Cf. Acts xxviii. 15, et seq.
48. Acts xviii. 2, 3. The expression *Ιουδαϊον* does not prove that he was not a Christian. Compare, for example, Gal. ii. 13.

49. The Acts (xviii. 2), it is true, do not say that they were Christians when St. Paul met them. But neither do they say that St. Paul converted them; and the contrary seems to arise from the canonical recital. It appears that the edict of Claudius applied only to those who had taken part in the brawls; but is it possible that this apostolic pair had taken part with the adversaries of "Chrestus"? Impossible that they had become Christians at Corinth; they had just arrived there; and, besides, there was no church at Corinth before the arrival of Paul, I. Cor. iii. 6, 10; iv. 14, 15; I, 2; ix. II. Cor. xi. 2, etc.
50. The assigning of the ancient title of St. Prisca, on the Aventine, to Priscilla, wife of Aquila, is the result of a confusion. See de Rossi (*Bull. di arch. crist.*, 1867, p. 44, et seq.), who does not succeed in tracing this identification further than the eighth century.
51. Acts xxviii, 14.
52. Paul Diacra, *Epitome* of Festus, at the word *Minorem Delum*; Dion. Cassius, XLVIII. 49, et seq.; LXVII. 14; Suetonius, *Aug.* 98; *Nero*, 31; Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 42, 43, 46; Pliny, *Hist. nat.* xiv. 8 (6); *Seneca, Epist.* lxxvii. 1, 2; Statius, *Silvæ.*, IV. iii. 26, 27. Ostia did not take all its importance until the departure of Trajan. It had, however, some Jews from the time of Claudius. De Rossi, *Bull.* 1866, p. 40.
53. Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 5; Jos. *Ant.* XVII. xii. 1; XVIII. vi. 4; vii. 2; *Vita*, 3; *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 5853; Jewish lamp found at Baïa (*mus. Parent.*)
54. Strabo, V. iv. 6.
55. Book of Enoch, ch. lxvii; Sibylline verses, IV. 130, et seq.; Apoc. ix. 1, et seq.
56. Dion. Cassius, LIX. 17; Suet. *Caius*, 37; Tacitus, *Ann.* XIV, 4; Jos. *Ant.* XIX. i. 1; Seneca, *De brevit. vitæ*, 18. Cf. Philo. *Leg.* § 44.
57. Acts xviii. 2; Comment. (of deacon Hilary) on the epistles of St. Paul, sequel of the works of St. Ambrose, Benedictine edition, vol. II. 2d part (Paris, 1686), col. 25 and 30. This commentary is by a man well versed in the traditions of the Roman church.
58. Rom. xiv. (?) xv. 1-13.
59. Rom. xiv. (?) xv. 8. Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.
60. Epiph. hær. xxx. 18. Comp. xxx. 2, 15, 16, 17.
61. Rom. xiv. (?). Homil. Pseudo-Clement, xiv. 1.
62. Commentary (of Hilary) before quoted, *ibid.* Comp. the allegation of Artemon, in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28; Homil. Pseudo-Clem. (work of Roman origin), xvi. 14, et seq.
63. This is the reason that the Judean-Christian and millenarian literature is better preserved in Latin than in Greek (4th book of Esdras, Little Genesis, Assumption of Moses). The Greek fathers of the

fourth and fifth centuries were very hostile to this literature, even to the apocalypse. The Greek church depends more directly on Paul than the Latin church. In the Orient, Paul had truly destroyed his enemies. Note the favorable reception which Montanism (a heresy which has some connection with Judea-Christianism) and other sects of the same kind found at Rome. Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* 1; St. Hippolyte (?) *Philosophum* ix. 7, 12, 13, et seq. See especially, in Eus. *H. E.* v. 28, concerning the heresy of Artemon and of Theodotus, remarking the principle of the Artemonites, according to which the traditional doctrine of the church of Rome had been altered dating from Zephyrin.

64. See the pseudo-Clementine homilies (Roman writing), especially homily xvii.

CHAPTER V.

1. The *προσχαρτερησις* or confirmation of the proselytes (see Schleusner, at the words *στρηριζω* and *επιστρηριζω*) was also one of the prejudices of the Jews. See *Antiq. du Bosph. Cimm.* II. *inscr.* 22.
2. II. Cor. xi. 2.
3. Acts xv. 37-39.
4. Acts xv. 39.
5. I. Cor. ix. 6.
6. Gal. ii. 13.
7. That results from I. Cor. ix 6.
8. Gal. ii. 9, 10.
9. I. Petri v. 12. There are doubts remaining of the identity of the two personages.
10. Acts xvi. 37, 38.
11. Acts xv. 41.
12. Passage of Beylan.
13. *Demir-Kapu*, or *Kara-Kapu*, now.
14. *Külek-Boghaz*, to-day.
15. Acts xvi. 1, 3; I. Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10, 11; Phil. ii. 20, 22; I. Tim. i. 2, II. Tim. ii. 22; iii. 10, 11. We can not take strictly the testimony of these last two epistles, which are fabricated. These testimonies, however, will not be altogether without value.
16. Phil. ii. 22. Cf. I. Tim. i. 2.
17. I. Cor. xvi. 10, 11.
18. Ibid.
19. Phil. ii. 20.
20. Acts xvi. 3. This shows well what is exaggerated and what is proper in xv. 41 and xvi. 4.

21. Gal. ii. 3-5. See 88, et seq.
22. I. Cor. ix. 20, et seq.; Rom. xv., et seq.
23. Gal. i. 9.
24. This seems the result of Acts xv. 36, and of Acts xvi. 6, marking what we have said upon the meaning of the word *Γαλατιχῆς*.
25. Acts xvi. 6; following the reading of the *Codex Vaticanus* and of the *Codex Sinaiticus*.
26. Comp. Acts ii. 9; vi. 9; xx. 16; I. Petri i. 1; Apocal. i. 4, explained by ii., iii. Comp. Ptolemy V. ii.; Strabo XII. viii. 15; Pliny v. 28.
27. Even Galian believes it. *De libris propriis*, ch. ii (Opp. vol. XIX., p. 18, 19, edit. Kühn).
28. See Buxtorf, *Lex. chald. talm. rabb.*, at the word *בת כירל*.
29. Acts viii. 26, 28, 39, 40; xvi. 6, 7, 9.
30. Acts xvi. 6.
31. Acts xvi. 7.
32. There remain quite important ruins of them. Texier, *Asie Min.*, p. 194, et seq.; Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 300, et seq.
33. They are about two metres in breadth.
34. Appears from Col. iv. verses 11, 14, compared together. Thus, the parts generally taken, which prevail in the book of Acts, are explained, especially ch. xv.
35. This is only a probable hypothesis. We admit that the narrator who, at the close of Acts, says "we" is the author of the third gospel and of the Acts (Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, III. xv. 1), and we see no reason not to identify him with Luke, companion of Paul, named in Col. iv. 14; Philemon 24; II. Tim. iv. 11. From this we must suppose that Luke joined Paul at Troas, since it is on leaving this city, that the "we" begins. But there were no Jews in Troas. As on the other hand, first, the narrator who says "we" seems to have remained at Philippi, dating from xvi. 17; second, that the xvi. 9, 10, have a physiognomy which causes reflection; third, that verses 12 and following seem, in spite of the slight error in *πρώτη* (an error which can be justified), to come from one acquainted with the country; fourth, that the narrator (Acts xix. 22 and xx. 1) is much more occupied with Macedonia than with Corinth, and is thus induced to err; fifth, as the narrator who says "we" appears on the scene at ch. xv. v. 5, at the moment when Paul passes to Philippi and regains Troas, we are led to suppose that the narrator who says "we" was a Macedonian. Two striking circumstances are, first, the detail and the exactitude of the recital in what touches the mission of Macedonia and the last journeys of Paul (xx. 5); the other, the knowledge of technical terms of navigation, shown in all the parts where the author says "we." Let us add that the author of the Acts knew very little of Judaism, and

that, on the contrary, he knew something of Greece and Greek philosophy (Acts xvii. 18, et seq.). Perhaps it was in admiration of the ways of Providence that he insists so much (xvi. 6, 7) on the revelations which imposed on Paul the itinerary which was to make them meet at Troas.

36. Most of the names found on the inscriptions of Philippi and Neapolis are Latin. Cf. Henzey, *Miss. de Maced.*, first part. The name of Lucanus or Lucas, moreover, was not very rare in the Orient. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 3829, 4700 k, 4759 (cf. add.).
37. Col. iv. 14; II. Tim. iv. 11.
38. Cf. Phil. ii. 20, et seq.
39. Compare the recital, Acts xxvii., xxviii., especially xxvii., 11, 21, et seq., recitals relative to St. Brandan.
40. Acts x. 2, 24; xvi. 15, 33, 34; xviii. 8.
41. Acts ix. 1, et seq.; Luc. vii. 4, 5. Comp. Acts xxvii. 3, et seq.
42. See *les Apôtres*, p. xxii., et seq.; 203, note 1; and above, note 38, Chap. I. His plan is always to show Paul delivered from the hands of the Jews by the Romans, Acts xxi., xxii., xxiii., etc.
43. Col. iv. 14.
44. Luke i. 46, et seq.; 68, et seq., ii. 14, 29, et seq., and in general, chapters i. and ii. Comp. *Vie de Jésus*, p. lxxxiii, et seq. (13th edit.)
45. Acts xvi. 9-11.

CHAPTER VI.

1. Notice the names of Sadoc, Sparadoc, Medoc, Amadoc, Olorus, Lutarius, Leonorius, Comontorius, Lomnoriis, Luarius, Cavarus, Bithocus or Bituitus (comp. *Revue num.*, new series, vol. i. 1856; Arvernian coins, Nos. 5, 6), Rabocentus, Bithicenthus, Zipacenthus (Heuzey), *Miss. de Mac.* p. 149, et seq.; *Art de vérif. les dates*, av. J. C. t. iii. p. 106-132). The inclination to drunkenness, so strong among the Thracians, is generally an indication of the Gallic or German race.
2. Appian, Civil Wars, iii. 79.
3. The Slavonic element predominates now in Macedonia.
4. Now Cavala, an important maritime port. See Heuzey, *Miss. de Maced.* p. 11, et seq. However, it is sometimes supposed that the ancient city was situated at Lefthéro-Limani or Eski-Cavala (the old Cavala,) 10 kilometres to the S. E. of Cavala, where there is a very good port. It is more probable that Lefthéro-Limani is the ancient *Daton*, which was gradually abandoned for the "new city," Neapolis or Neopolis. See Perrot, in the *Revue arch.*, July, 1860, p. 45, et seq. In fact,

Lefthéro is far from the Egnatian road and farther from Philippi than Cavala.

5. Appian, *Civil Wars*, iv. 106; Heuzey p. 15, et seq.
6. Now entirely destroyed. Beautiful ruins. Even the name, which was preserved in that of the village of *Filibédjek*, is now lost. See Heuzey, *Miss. de Maced.*, first part.
7. Henzey, *Miss. de Maced.*, p. 33, 34.
8. Strabo vii. *Fragm.* 41.
9. Acts xvi. 12; Dion Cassius L.I. 4; Pliny *II. N.* iv. 18; Digest L. xv. 6; the coins and inscriptions. Cf. Heuzey, p. 17, 18, 72.
10. Heuzey, *Miss. de Maced.*, all the part relative to Philippi and its surroundings. Later, Greek became predominant.
11. Heuzey, p. 40, 41, 46, 140.
12. Heuzey, p. iv. v. 42. 137, 138, etc.
13. Heuzey, p. 78, et seq.
14. *Cultores sancti Silvani*, Heuzey, p. 69, et seq.
15. Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.*, No. 1800; Steiner, *Inscr. Germ.*, No. 1275.
16. On the worship of Bacchus at Philippi, see Appian, *Civil Wars*, iv. 106; Heuzey p. 79, 80.
17. Heuzey, p. 39. See particularly the beautiful inscription of Doxato: Heuzey, p. 128, et seq. Cf. *Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, July, 1868, p. 219, et seq. Compare the tomb of Vibia at Rome (Garrucci, *Tre sepolcri*, etc., Napoli, 1862).
18. Strabo X. iii. 16; Schol. d'Arist., in *Vesp.* 9; Macrobian. *Saturn.* i. 18; Heuzey, p. 28-31, 80; Wagner, *Inscr. d'Asie Min.*, p. 3, et seq.
19. Inscription of Doxato.
20. Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.*, II. 2; IV. 14 (16), 16, (19); VI. 6; VII. 8; *De causis plant.* IV. 12, (13); Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, XXI. 10. There are still near *Dekili-tasch* many beautiful vegetable gardens.
21. See *les Apôtres*, p. 294, 295.
22. This results from Acts xvi. 13, et. seq., compared to Acts xvii. 1, 10.
23. Appian, "Civil Wars." iv. 106, 107; Dion Cassius xlviii. 47. Now the river of Bonarbachi. See the plan of Philippi by M. Heuzey, and the text, p. 67, 106, 120. Herodotus (vii. 113) speaks of a river Angites (really *Angista*) which he says empties into the Strymon east of Pangia. It is perhaps the same name as Gangites; the river Buonarbachi is, in fact, the largest affluent of Philippi, which flows into the Angista, then into the Strymon. See Kiepert's map of Turkey, and Consinéry, *Voy. dans la Macéd.* ii. p. 45, et seq.
24. This mass of water proceeding solely from one source, such as the Loire, was indeed enough to inspire the ancients with religious ideas.
25. The arch called *Kiëmer*, situated near the place mentioned in the Acts, may have been erected in memory of the battle. Heuzey, p. 118-120.

26. Inscr. in the *Antiquités du Bosphore cimmérien*, No. 22; *Mel. grecorum*. of the Acad. of Saint Petersburg, ii. p. 200, et seq.; Epiph. *Contra Hær.* lxxx. Comp. Juvenal iii. 296.
27. Jos. *Ant.* XIV. x. 23; Pseudo-Aristeas, p. 67 (édit. Moriz Schmidt); Philo. *In Flaccum*, § 14; Tertullian. *De jej.* 16.
28. Compare as analagous *Κορινθία Corp. Inscr. gr.*, No. 3847 *n*; Le Bas iii. No. 1022; *Miss. de Phén.* inscr. of Sidon.
29. Pliny H. N. VII. 57; Maxim. of Tyr. xl. 2; Valerius Flaccus iv. 368, 369; Claudian *Rapt. Proserp.* i. 276; Elian *Anim.* iv. 45; Strabo XIII. iv. 14. Comp. *Corpus i. g.*, Nos. 3496, 3497, 3498, 3924, 3938; Le Bas III. 1687; Wagner in the *Reveu de l'instr. publ. en Belgique*, 1868, p. 1, et seq. The Jews seem to have been particularly addicted to this trade (Wagner l. c).
30. See Lévy, *Epigr. Beiträge*, p. 312, 313.
31. Acts xvi. 13, et seq.; Phil. iv. 2, 3.
32. Phil. i. 3, et., seq. ii, 12.
33. *Expl. de la Gal.* p. 88; Le Bas (Waddington) iii., No. 722. For its name, see *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 2264 *m*; Perrot.
34. Phil. iv. 2, 3.
35. Phil. ii. 25, et seq.
36. Phil. iv. 3.
37. Phil. ii. 19, 23.
38. Phil. iv. 10, et seq. Cf. I. Thess. ii. 5, 7, 9; II. Cor. xi., et seq.
39. *Γνήσιε θυγατρ*, Phil. iv. 3. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 6) and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 30) understand that in the sense of wife. It is remarkable that Lydia is not named in the epistle to the Philippians; the total omission of such an important personage would be singular. The rôle that Paul lent to the *γνήσιος θυγάτηρ* (v. 3) agrees also with the rich Lydia (*συλλαμβάνου*). Some take *Σύζυγος* as a proper name. We have but one other example of such a name.
40. Compare *γνήσιον τέκνον*, I. Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. Paul called the mother of Rufus after the same manner "my mother" (Rom. xvi. 13).
41. Besides Clément of Alexandria and Eusebius, before quoted, see Pseudo-Ignatius, *Ad. Philad.* 4 (Dressel). Cf. *les Apôtres*, p. 172.
42. Pliny *Epist.* x. 97.
43. Plutarch, *De defectu orac.* 9; Hesychius, at the word *Πύθων*; Scoliast of Aristophanes, ad *Vesp.* v. 1019.
44. Timothy and Luke were, without doubt, not present at the act of exorcism.
45. It was the name given to the first magistrates of the colonies.
46. See the Greek dictionaries at the word *ἀγοραῖος*.
47. Acts xvi. 37.

48. Acts xvi. 22, 23, 37; I. Thess. ii. 2; II. Cor. i. 25; Phil. i. 30.
49. The recital of the eye-witness, just now so clear, here becomes confused, by the desire he has to find everywhere miracles, and the conversions of sinners, or persons of base profession, by sudden gifts of grace. Is it surprising that a disciple of Paul believed that his master performed miracles, when Paul himself declared having done so? Did not Porphyre attribute miracles to Plotin, his master, with whom he had lived for years? The miraculous deliverances from prison were the most ordinary themes of the apostolic miracles, Acts v., xii. The prejudice of the jailor is found in the recital of ch. xii., who, besides, like the one we now discuss, bore almost ocular testimony.
50. Acts xvi. 37.
51. Acts v. 41; II. Cor. xi. 23, et seq.
52. For the doubts which this episode raises, see hereafter note 42, ch. XIX.
53. *Cic. in Verrem* II. v. 62, et seq.
54. For Timothy, that results from Acts xvii. 4, 10, 14, 15. For Luke, from the fact that "we" does not appear again until Acts xx. 5, at the time of the third mission, where Paul returned to the "coasts" of Macedonia and of Troas.
55. It might be supposed that Paul went by the north of the Pangea (Leake, "Travels in northern Greece," iii. p. 179, 180; Conybeare and Howson I, p. 340). But, besides some traces, which may be those of the Ignatian road, seen on the south, I am convinced that to-day, to go from *Dekeli-tasch* (the khan of Philippi) to Ienikeui, we should pass through the valley which extends from Pravista to Orfani.
56. Titus-Livy XLV. 29 (cf. Pliny iv. 17); notwithstanding Acts vi. 12, see Strabo vii. fragment 21. Amphipolis has almost entirely disappeared. Quite a flourishing village (Ienikeui) has risen in its place.
57. Acts xvii. 1.
58. See Cousinery, *Voy. en Mac.* i. 116, et seq.; Clark, *Travels*, iv. p. 381, et seq.; Leake iii. 170, et seq., 461.
59. Plutarch, Life of Lyscurgus, 31; Vitruve VIII. iii. 16; Pliny H. N. xxxi. 19; Aulu-Gelle xv. 20; Am. Marcel. xxvii. 4; *Itin. de Bordeaux* p. 604 (Wesseling); *Anthol. palat.* vii. 51; Clark, l. c.
60. Pliny iv. 17; *Itin. Ant.* p. 320 Wesseling; Etienne de Byzance, s. h. v. Doubtless identical with ruins called Pollina, situated south of the eastern extremity of lake Betschik-Gueul. (See Kiepert's map of Turkey; Cousinery i. 115, 116, and the map; Leake, iii. p. 457, et seq.; Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 343, 344). This name is now almost unknown in the country. Not to confound the Apollonia in question, with the Apollonia situated on the coast between Neapolis and the mouth of the Strymon.

61. Strabo, VII. vii. 4; Lucian *Lucius*, 46; Appien, Civil Wars, VI. 118.
62. Acts xvii. 1.
63. Acts xvii 4.
64. I. Thess. i. 5, 9, 65. I. To understand this passage, compare Acts vi. 8; x. 38; I. Cor. v. 4; xii. 28; Col. i. 11.
65. I. Thess. i. 5.
66. See the two epistles to the Thessalonians.
67. I. Thess. ii. 7, et seq.
68. I. Thess. ii. 1-12.
69. I. Thess. ii. 5.
70. Rom. xvi. 21. In the sense of *συγγενής*, see *les Apôtres*, p. 108, note 6.
71. I. Thess. ii. 9; II. Thess. iii. 8, et seq.
72. Phil. iv. 16; I. Thess. ii. 5, 7, 9.
73. I. Thess. iv. 11; II. Thess. iii. 10-12.
74. See *Vie de Jésus*, p. 126, note.
75. II. Thess. ii. 5.
76. I. Thess. i. 7.
77. I. Thess. i. 8, 9.
78. Acts xix. 29; xx. 4. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 1967.
79. Col. iv. 10, 11.
80. Acts xvii. 5, et seq.; I. Thess. i. 6; ii. 2, 14, et seq.; iii. 4.
81. Comp. the inscription of Thessalonica, *Corp. i. gr.*, No. 1967.
82. Exists to this day under this name (*Véria*, or *Kara-Verria*). Cf. Cousinéry i. 57, et seq.; Leake, iii. 290, et seq.
83. I. Thess. ii. 14, iii. 3, 5; II. Thess. i. 4; et seq.
84. Acts xvii. 11.
85. Acts xx. 4; Rom. xvi. 21 (Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 1967), upon the meaning of *συγγενής*, see p. 120.
86. Acts xvii. 14, 15, read ἔως.
87. Acts xvi. 13; xvii. 4.
88. *Σεβομεναί*, or *εὐόχημονες*.

CHAPTER VII.

1. That Paul made this voyage by sea, we learn from Acts xvii. 14, 15. To go from Bérca to Athens by land, it really is not necessary to come by the coast; the land route being full of difficulties and by-ways; therefore it was more natural that Paul came to Corinth before going to Athens. Paul probably embarked near Méthone. See Strabo vii., fragm. 20-22; Leake iii. 435, et seq.

2. It is the route now followed; but it is possible that St. Paul passed around Eubœa, according to M. Kiepert.
3. Cicero *Epist. ad Quintum fratrem*, i. 1; Sulpicius to Cic., *Epist. fam.*, iv. 5; *Ad Att.* v. 10; vi. 1; Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 53; Pliny the younger, *Epist.* viii. 24; Philostratus, *Vie d'Apoll.*, v. 41; *Vie de Sept. Sév.* 3.
4. Polybius xxxvii. 4; xl. 3; Cicero, in Pisonem, 40; letter of Sulpicius to Cicero, *Ad fam.*, iv. 5; Strabo, VIII. viii. 1; IX. 11, 5-25; iii. 8 v. 15; Plutarch, *De def. orac.*, 5-8; Pausanias II. xviii. 3; xxxviii. 2; VII. xvii. 1; Jos. B. J., I. xxi. 11, 12.
5. For later traces, see Tillemont, *Hist. des emp.* ii. p. 317.
6. Cicero, *In Pis.* 40. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* t. 76-80.
7. Such mention is frequently made in Pausanias. Augustus caused a great number of statues to be erected; especially around the temple of Apollo Palatinus.
8. Ruins such as those of Tirynthæ, Mycenus, and Ithome suffice to prove it. Such ruins are not seen, except in countries which have never recovered from ancient disaster.
9. See however, Wescher and Foucart, *Inscr. rec. à Delphes*, Nos. 57 and 364; (inscriptions of year 180 B. C., or thereabout) and Philo, *Leg.* § 36.
10. Plutarch, *Moral Treatises* in general; Dion Cassius LXXII. 14. Cf. *les Apôtres*, p. 338, 339.
11. *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 120; *Arch. des miss. scient.*, second series, vol. IV. p. 485, et seq. 514; Aug. Mommsen, *Athenæ Christianæ*, p. 120; Pausanias i. xviii. 4; Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* 27.
12. Plutarch, *Conjugalia præc.*, 19.
13. Acts xvii. 15.
14. Acts xvii. 16-23.
15. Pausanias, I. xxii. et seq.; Beulé, *l'Acropole d'Athènes*, I. p. 272, et seq.
16. Cic. *In Verr.* II. i. 17; *In Pisonem*, 40.
17. Beulé *l'Acropole d'Ath.* I. p. 135-336 et seq. 345; II. 28, 29, 206 et seq. Comp. Cicero, *Ad Att.* VI. 1, 18.
18. Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* xxxi. p. 409, 410 (Emperius). The description of Pausanias does not complain of interruptions. At least, statues of religious character were not disturbed in Athens. Beulé, I. 320, et seq. 337.
19. *Fragm. hist. græc.* of Ch. Müller, II. p. 254; Philostratus, *Apoll.* II. 23.
20. Acts xvii. 16, on the meaning of *χαττίδωλος*. See Schleusner, s. h. v.
21. Acts xvii. 22. Compare the inscriptions of the theatre of Dionysius and Isocrates, *Panégyr.* 33; Plato, *Deuxième Alcib.*, 12; Thucydides II. 38; Pausanias I. xvii; I. xxiv. 3; X. xxviii. 6; Strabo IX.

- i. 16; X. iii. 18; Joseph, *Contra Aponiem* II. 37; Dionys. of Halic., *De Thucydide* 40; Pliny the younger, *Epist.* VIII. 24; Philostratus, *Vie d'Apoll.* IV. xix; VI. iii. 5; the same, *Epist.* 47; Elian, *Varie Hist.* V. 17; Julian *Misopagon*, p. 348 (Spanheim); Iimérius, in Photius, cod. CCXLIII. p. 356 (Bekker) p. 9., edit. Didot.
22. Titus Livius, XLV. 27; Petronius, Sat. c. 17.
23. Acts xvii. 23.
24. Pausanias I. i. 4; Philostratus *Vie d'Apoll.* VI. iii. 5; Diogenes Laërtius, I. x. 110; Œcuménienus. *In Act. apost.* Paris (1631), p. 136, 137. Isidorus of Pelusium, *Catena in Act. apost.* of Cramer (Oxford 1844) p. 292; Saint Jerome, *In Tit.* I, 12; (col. 420, Martianay.) The passages of the false Lucian, Philopatris, 9-29, are only an allusion to the passages of Acts. We can compare the inscriptions of Rome: *sci deo, sci deæ* (Orelli, Nos. 961, 1798, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2270, 2271, 5054, 5952). Cf Aulu-Gelle II. 28. The question which was raised at the end of the seventeenth century, upon the worship of unknown saints, corresponds with the same order of religious scruples.
25. Pausanias V. xiv. 8.
26. Pausanias I. i. 4; Pollux, *Onom.* Hésychius, at the words *Ἀγνώστους θεοί*.
27. We have never found an inscription thus conceived. The inscription to an unknown God which the Capuchins, towards 1670, declared having seen in the Parthenon, is an imposture. (Spon sought it in vain in 1676; Voy. II. p. 83; edit. de La Haye, 1724.) Unless the Christians had put such an inscription at some chapel. The Parthenon passed for the temple of the unknown god. See Laborde, *Athènes aux XV^e XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* I. 24, note 50, note 78, note 217, note. 233 et seq.; Ross, *Archæol. Aufsätze*, I. 253, 273, et seq.; Aug. Mommsen, *Athenæ Christianæ*, p. 33, et seq.
28. See the passages of Diogenes Laërtius, precited.
29. Saint Justin, *Apol.* II. 10, seemed to have made allusion to the same idea, and it is doubtful if he takes it in Acts. Cf. Irenæus *Adv. hæres.* I. xx. 3. Had that been the sense, the inscription had offered: *Θεῷ ἁγνώστῳ*, and not *Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ*. Cf. Saint Jerome, *In Tit.* i. 12.
30. Acts xvii. 27. Comp. Rom. i. 20, et seq.; Justin, *Apol.* II. 10.
31. Lucan II. 592-93. Cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, § 44.
32. Acts xvii. 23-28. See p. 137.
33. It is probable, in fact, that Cleanthes and Artus borrowed it from some older hymns, which were in the mouths of all.
34. Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 55.
35. Dion Cassius, XLVII. 20; Plutarch, Brutus, 24.
36. Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 53 and 55. See Velleius Paterculus, II. 23.

37. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.*, 38, et seq.; Plutarch, *Vie de Sylla*, 14; Velleius Paterculus, II. 23.
38. Strabo, IX. i. 20; Cic. *In Pis.* 16; Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 53; Pliny, *Hist. nat.* IV. 11; Pliny *Epist.* VIII. 24; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* xxxi. p. 396 (Emperius); Ælius Aristides, *Romæ encomium*, p. 363, 364 (Dindorf); *Panathen.*, p. 298; year 66 Nero liberated all the Greeks; year 73 Vespasian reduced Achaïa to a Roman province; nevertheless Athens retained its immunities of a free city.
39. See particularly the letter of Pliny the younger to Maximus leaving for Achaïa (*Epist.* VIII. 24.)
40. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 3831.
41. Cic. *de Oratore* I. 11; *Acad. priorum* 11, entire.
42. Plutarch, *Vie de Brutus*, 24.
43. Horace *Epist.* II. ii. 44-45; Cic. *Ad fam.* xvi. 21.
44. Suetonius, Néro, 52.
45. The collection of *ephebic* inscriptions made by M. Wescher leaves a complete void for the first century. See, however, the *Φιλίστωρ*, vol. IV. p. 332.
46. Strabo, IV. 15.
47. Plut. *De EI apud Delphos*, 1, et seq.; Eunapius *Vitæ soph.* proœm. p. 5 (Boissonade.)
48. Beulé I. 322, 340, and the surroundings; II. 206, et seq.; 301, 305, Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* 309, et seq.; 363, et seq.; *Berichte dei sächs. Gesell. philol.* Classe, XII. p. 218, et seq.
49. Beulé II. p. 206, et seq.
50. Nos. 99, et 381, of Pittakis, *Εφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική*, 1838, p. 240; and 1840, p. 318.
51. Beulé II. p. 207.
52. A large number of offerings and inscriptions of the Acropolis belong to this time. Beulé I. 322, 339, et seq.; I. 206, et seq.; 301, 305.
53. Strabo, IX. i. 20; Plut. *Vie de Sylla*, 14; Florus, *Epitome* II. 39.
54. Cicero, *Ad Att.* VI. 1.
55. Appian, *Civ. War*, II. 70.
56. Plutarch, *Life of Pompey*, 42.
57. Appian, *Civ. Wars*, II. 88.
58. *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 312, 477.
59. Appian, *Civ. Wars*, V. 7. 76; Plut. *Life of Antony* 33, 34.
60. *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 312, 477.
61. *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 309, et seq.; 365, et seq.
62. Strabo, IX. i. 20.
63. Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 53.
64. Suetonius, Néro, 56.
65. Suetonius, Néro, 34; Dion Cassius, LXIII. 14; Cf. Pausanias I. xxviii. 6.

66. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 362; Cf. Plut. *Quæst. symp.* I. x. 1.
67. *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 265, 357-362; Jos. *B. J.* I. xxi. 11; Vitruvius V. ix. 1; Suetonius, Aug., 60.
68. See especially Lysistrata 750, et seq.
69. Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius*, 23, 24.
70. Plut. *Life of Sylla*, 13.
71. Letter of Marcus-Aurelius to Fronto, III. 9 (Mar. p. 73); Dion Cass. LXXII. 31; Julius Capitolinus, *Life of Marcus Aurelius*, 27; Philostr. *Life of Sept. Sev.*, 13.
72. Plut. *Life of Sylla*, 13; Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus*, 2, 4; Horace *Epist.* II. ii. 43, et seq.; Cicero, *In Cæcil.*, 12; Cf. *Athenæus*, XII. 69, Wescher, in the *Moniteur Universel*, April 13, 1861.
73. Cicero, *Ad Att.* XII. 32; *Ad fam.* XII. 16; XVI. 21; *De off.* I. 1; Dion Cassius, XLV. 15; Ovid, *Trist.* I. ii. 77.
74. Cicero, *Ad fam.* XVI. 21; Lucian, *Nigrinus*, 13, et seq.; *Dialogues des morts*, xx. 5; Philostratus *Apoll.* IV. 17.
75. *Corp. inscr. gr.*, Nos. 246, 254, 255, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280, 281, 282, 286; *Εφημερίς αρχαιολογική* of Pittakis, 1860, Nos. 4041, et seq.; 4097, et seq.; 1862, (new series), Nos. 199-204, 214-217. *Φιλίστωρ* (literary journal of Athens), vol. III. p. 60, 150, 277, 350, 444, 549; vol. IV. p. 73, 164, 171, 265, 392, 458, 545, et seq.; especially 332, et seq.; Wescher at *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscr.* 5th April, 1861, and to the *Moniteur Univ.*, 23th April, 1861.
76. See *bas reliefs éphébiques* of the Museum of the Archeological Society, in the buildings of the University of Athens.
77. Cic. *Ad. fam.* XVI. 21, recalls the role of Polybius in Roman society of his time.
78. For example, young Cicero. See Brut. ad Cic. II. 3.
79. Plutarch, *Vie de Brutus*, 24; Horace, *Carm.*, II. vii. 9, 10; *Epist.* II. ii. 46, et seq.; Brut. ad Cic. II. 3.
80. Acts xvii. 21. Comp. Demosth. I. Phil. 4; XI. Phil. (in *Epist. Phil.*) 17 (Voemel); Elian, V. II. V. 13; Scolia of Thucydides, III. 38; Scol. of Aristophanes, *Plutus*, 338.
81. Himerius, *Ecloga*, iii. ex Photio, cod. CCXLIII. (p. 8-11, edit. Didot).
82. Consequence of Acts xvii. 14; xviii. 5; I. Thess. iii. 1, 2.
83. Acts 17; Cf. Philo. Leg. § 36; *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 9900.
84. Acts xvii. 17.
85. Acts xvii. 19, 20. In the second century the resurrection is still an objection to Christianity. See Athenagoras (of Athens) *On the Resurrection of the Dead*.
86. It is thus that the Greek interpreters, Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Œcumenius, understood verse 18.

87. Cf. II. Etienne. *Thes.* at this word.
88. Edict of Justinian.
89. See p. 307, 318.
90. Val. Max. II. vi. 3; Tac. *Ann.* II, 55; Aulus Gellius, XII. 7; Am. Mar. XXIX. II, 19.
91. Val. Max. VIII. i. *amb.* 2; Aulus Gellius, xii. 7; Cic. *Pro Balbo*, 12; Ælius Aristides, *Panathen.* p. 314 (Dindorf).
92. Cicero, *De nat. deorum*, ii. 29; Pausanias, I. xxviii. 5, 8; Plutarch, *An seni sit ger. resp.* 20; *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 480, 3831.
93. *Ἡ Βουλὴ ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείουπάγου, ἡ Βουλὴ τῶν ἐξακοσίων, ὁ δῆμος.* See *Corp. inscr. gr.* Nos. 263, 313, 315, 316, 318, 320, 361, 370, 372, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 397, 400, 402, 406, 415, 416, 417, 420, 421, 422, 426, 427, 433, 438, 444, 445, 446, 480, 3831; these Nos. 84, 104, 146, 149, 333, 363, 726, and 729 (cf. 727 and 728), 1008, 1010, of Pittakis, in the *Εφημερίς αρχαιολογική* of Athens, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842. No. 726 is anterior to the Christian Era; the Areopagus alone erected the statue. The Nos. 333 and 726 are anterior to the Roman dominion, and prove that the Areopagus, from an ancient period, had the right of erecting statues. See also Rangabe, *Hellenic Antiquities*, II. No. 1178; Ross, *Demen. inscr.* Nos. 141, 163, 165; *Berichte der sächs Gesellschafft der Wiss.* Cl. XII. p. 218; *Φιλολίτωρ*, vol. III. p. 60, 363, 364, 463, 564, 565; vol. IV. p. 83, 171; *Ann. of the Arch. Inst.* vol. xxxiv. p. 139, without mentioning one or two unpublished inscriptions.
94. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 361.
95. Plutarch, *Life of Cic.* 24 Himerius, in Photius, cod. ccxliii. p. 365, 366. edit. Bekker; Quintilian, V. ix. 13.
96. Lysias, *Areopagitica or pro sacra olea* entire; Demosth. (?), *Contra Neera*, § 80 et seq. Eschines, *Contra Timarcus*, 81. et seq. Dione- genes Laërtes, II. viii. 15; xi. 5; VII. v. 2; Xenophon, *Mem.* III. v. 20; Cic. *Epist. ad fam.* xiii. 1; *Ad Att.* v. 11; *De divin.* i. 25. Athenæus, iv. 64, 65; vi. 46; xiii. 21; Plut. *De plac. phil.* I. vii. 2; *Corps. inscr. gr.* No. 123; Ross, *Demen. inscr.* No. 163.
97. Comp. Josephus, *Contra Apion*, ii. 37, and Lysias, fragm. 175 (*Orat. attici* of Didot). Nothing in the recital of Acts implies that Paul was the object of a judicial action before the tribunal. However, the words *ἐπιλαβόμενοι ἡγάγον*, of the v. 19, show clearly that in the intention of the narrator the mention of the Areopagus is simply an indication of place. Besides, it is probable that at the Roman epoch the name of "Areopagus" had no longer topographic force. The narrow rock in the open air which bore this name must have seemed very unsuitable. They substituted some edifice (Vitruvius II. i. 5), or,

rather, they transferred the institution to the Royal Portico, to the Basilica (Demosth.) I. *contra Aristog.* § 23, situated near the hill. In spite of this translation, the name of "Areopagus" could remain, as in our day, at Athens, to designate a "tribunal of the Rota;" "court of the Arches," etc., were formerly justified, but are so no longer.

98. Luke, who is not a stranger to rhetoric, probably arranged a little the *mise en scène* and the attitude of his orator. The discourse cannot be considered as authentic as if stenographed by an auditor, or written immediately after by him who delivered it. We see in the narrator a true Athenian sentiment, which suggests to him some points appropriate to his auditors; but, after all, it is not impossible that Paul obeyed the oratorical necessities of the time. The idea of the "unknown God," and the quotation of Aratus might be familiar to the apostles. Timothy, besides, was at Athens with Paul, and might have remembered all this. The style of the piece is not unlike Paul; for the ideas compare Rom. i.
99. Comp. Jos. *Contra Apion*, I. 12. Δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ought to be taken in good part, as St. John Chrysostom has seen. Cf. Pollux, i. 21. See Schleusner, s. h. v.
100. This verse is found in Aratus, *Phanom.* 5, and in Cleanthus, *Hymn to Jupiter*, 5.
101. Compare Seneca, *Epist.* xcv. 51, et seq; *De Beneficiis*, iv. 19; Dion. Chrysostom, *orat.* XII. p. 231, 232 (edit. Emperius); Porphyry, *ad Marcellam*, ch. 11, 18.
102. Now deposited at the museum of the Archeological Society, in the buildings of the University of Athens. See *Αρχαιολογική εφημερίς*, 1862, pl. xxx, xxxi, xxxiii.
103. See, especially, the *Φιλίστωρ*, iv. p. 332, et seq. Comp. of other inscriptions, *ibid.* and note 75, chap. vii.
104. I. *Thess.* ii. 17 et seq.
105. I. *Thess.* iii. 3, 5.
106. I. *Thess.* iii. 1, et seq.
107. Recall, above all, the beautiful little Byzantine churches of Athens.
108. See, as a type of this, the descriptions of the festivities of the first of May, which appear annually in the Athenian journals; for example, the *Παλιγγενεσία*, and the *Εθνοψύλαξ* of the year 1865.
109. See the collection of Fauriel and of Passow. Note especially the rôle of Charon, of the Tartarus, etc.
110. In the fifteenth century, Gemist Plethous in our day, Theophilus Caïri.
111. Recall Coraï.
112. I. *Thess.* iii. 6.

113. There is no epistle of Paul "to the Athenians," nor any mention of the church of Athens in the Epistles to the Corinthians. In his third voyage Paul does not touch at Athens.
114. Acts xvii. 34; Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, II. E. iv. 23. The slightly legendary character of what the Acts relates on the sojourn of Paul at Athens leaves some doubts on all this. *Ἀρεοπαγίτης* always designates a member of the tribunal, a personage of dignity. *Areopagita* was a title respected, and sought after in the whole world. (See the texts before quoted, especially Cic.; *Pro. Balbo*, 12; Trebellius Pollio, Gallienus 11; *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 372.) It is hard to believe that a person of this rank was converted.
115. A singular name, perhaps, for *Δάμαλιν*, a name borne by some Athenian women. Pape. *Wört. der griech. Eigennamen*, s. h. v. Cf. Horace, *Carm.* I. xxxvi. 13, et seq.; Heuzey, *Miss. de Maced.* p. 136. Perhaps, also, *Damaris* is a Semitic name. Several Phœnician inscriptions have been found at Athens, and at Pirus.
116. Dionysius of Corinth, *l. c.*
117. See the discourse of Julian, *Ad S. P. 2. Atheniensem*, and the *Misopogon*, p. 348 (Spanheim).
118. St. Gregory of Naz., *Orat.* xliii. 14, 15, 21, 23, 24; *Carm.* p. 634, 636, 1042 (Caillau); Synesius Epist. liv. (p. 190, Petau) Marinus, Life of Proclus, 10. Malala, XVIII. p. 451 (Boun).
119. *Aïa Vasili* is the *Stoa vasilios*; the church of the twelve apostles, the temple of the twelve gods; *Aïa Paraskévi* the Pompéion, Rangabé, in the *memorie dell' Istituto di corr. arch.*, vol. II. (1865), p. 346, et seq.; Aug. Mommsen, *Athene christiana*, p. 4, 5, 50, 51, 61, 99, 145. As contrast, compare Libanus, where the destruction of Paganism was violent and instantaneous. Although the remains of antique temples are encountered at every step, we find no examples there of such close contact.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. The place is now almost a desert. There are some remains of the works of the port. The old name (*Kēchrias*) is preserved. Cf. Curtius, *Peloponnesus*, p. 537, et seq.
2. The actual valley of Hexamili.
3. The site of old Corinth is now almost abandoned. The city was rebuilt a league and a half from there, on the Gulf of Patras.
4. Plutarch does not consider it as such, *De def. orac.*, 8.

5. Strabo, VIII. vi. 22, 23; Pausanias, II. i. 2. Corinth presents only one ruin of Hellenic construction.
6. Strabo, VIII. vi. 23; Aristides, Or. III. p. 37, et seq. edit. Dindorf.
7. See the inscriptions of Corinth, in the *Corpus inscr. gr.*, No. 1104 et seq.
8. Pausanias II. i. 2; v. i. 2.
9. Lucian, *Demonax*, 57; *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 1106.
10. Athenæus (VI. 103), counts there 460,000 slaves.
11. Aristoph, *Plutus*, V. 149; Horace *Ep.* I. xvii. 36; Juvenal *Sat.* viii. 113; Maximus of Tyr. Dissert. III. 10; Dio Chrysos. orat. XXXVII. p. 530-534; (Emp.) Athenæus VII. 13; XIII. 21, 32, 54; Cic. *De rep.* II. 4; Alciphron; *Epist.* III. 60; Strabo, VIII. vi. 20, 21; XII. iii. 36; Horace, *Sat.* I. xvii. 36; Eustathius, *Ad Illaus* I. v. 570; *Eliau His. var.* I. 19; Aristides op. cit. p. 39; Hesychius at the word *χορινθιαζειν*.
12. This is seen from the moral treatises of Plutarch; especially of *Præc. ger. reip. An seni sit ger. resp. Consolatio ad uxorem, Conjugalia præc. Amatorius, De frat. amore*.
13. Acrocorinth is much like Mount Eryx in Sicily.
14. Strabo VIII. vi. 20, 21.
15. Philo. *Leg.* § 36.
16. Strabo VIII. vi. 22.
17. Acts xviii. 2.
18. Strabo VIII. vi. 22, 23; Aristides op. cit. p. 38; *Κοινή παντῶν χατηφυγή*, . . . ὁδὸς καὶ δωιεξοδὸς ἄτωνπον ἀνθρώπων.
19. Acts xviii. 2, 3.
20. I. Thess. ii. 14; iii. 6, 7; II. Thess. i. 4, et seq.
21. I. Thess. iv. 10.
22. Acts xviii. 5; I. Thess. i. 1; iii. 6; II. Thess. i. 1; II. Cor. i. 19.
23. Acts xviii. 4, et seq.
24. I. Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15-17.
25. Comp. Acts xix. 9.
26. I. Cor. i. 14-16.
27. I. Cor. xii. 2.
28. Acts xviii. 9, 10.
29. I. Thess. i. 7-9.
30. I. Cor. ii. 4, 5.
31. II. Cor. xii. 12.
32. II. Cor. i. 1.
33. I. Cor. i. 11-14; xvi. 17; Rom. xvi. 23; II. Tim. iv. 20.
34. Titus iii. 13. Zenas is there associated with Apollos. It is supposed that the letter to Titus was written from Corinth.
35. I. Cor. xvi. 15, 16-18.

36. I. Cor. i. 20-26, et seq.
37. Strabo, VIII. vi. 22.
38. Pausanias II. ii. 3; Curtius *Peloponnesus*, p. 538, 594; Millingen *Rec. de quelques medailles grecques*, p. 47, 48; pl. II. No. 19.
39. Rods. xvi. 1, 2.
40. Amt xviii. 4, et seq.; perhaps even longer, if the lapse of time indicated in verse 18 should be added to that mentioned in v. 11.
41. I. Cor. ii. 3.
42. I. Thess. i. 7, et seq.; II. Thess. i. 4.
43. I. Cor. ix. 4, et seq.; II. Cor. xi. 8. et seq.; xii. 13, 14, 16; Phil. iv. 15.
44. I. Thess. ii. 14, 16; II. Thess. i. 6, 8; II. Cor. iii. 14-16.
45. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.
46. Seneca the rhetorician, *Controv.* II. ii. etc.; preface of books I. III. IV; Ovid *Pont.* IV. ix.
47. Seneca, *De ira*, init, *De Vita beatta*, init, *Quæst natur.* IV.; præf. V. ii.; Epist. CIV; *Consol. ad Marciam*, Statius *Silvæ* II. vii. 32; Pliny *Hist. nat.* XXXI. 33; Tac. *Ann.* VI. 3; XV. 73; XVI. 17; Dion Cassius, LXI. 20; Eusebius *Chron.* in the tenth year of Nero.
48. Seneca *Quæst. natur.* V. ii.
49. Dion Cassius LX. 35.
50. Pliny the younger, *Epistles* VIII. 24.
51. Dion Cassius, LXII. 25; Eusebius, *Chron.* l. c.
52. Acts XVIII. 12, et seq.
53. Acts xviii. 14, 15.
54. Acts XVIII. 17; the words *οἱ Ἕλληνες* are missing in the best manuscripts.
55. II. Thess. iii. 1, 2. Compare the two epistles to the Corinthians. See p. 173, et seq.
56. I. Thess. ii. 17, 18; iii. 6-10.
57. II. Thess. iii. 1, 2.

CHAPTER IX.

1. II. Cor. xi. 2.
2. *Ibid.*
3. I. Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, 40.
4. I. Thess. i. 6; Philipp. iii. 17; iv. 9.
5. Cicero, *Ad famil.* iii. 9; xv. 17; xvi. 5, 21; *Ad Attic.* i. 5; iii. 7; Pliny, *Epist.* ii. 12; viii. 3; ix. 28; Seneca *Epist.* I.; Forcellini, word *tabelarius*; Naudet in the *Mém de l' Acad. des inscr.* vol. xxiii. 2d part, p. 166, et seq.

6. See the 2d book of *Maccabees*, I. 1, et seq.; 10, et seq.; Baruch, c. VI, (Apocr.)
7. Comp. the *iggeret* or *risâlet*, that the synagogues applied among themselves in respect to divers points of doctrine or ceremony under discussion.
8. II. Thess. ii. 2, 14; iii. 14.
9. I. Thess. v. 27.
10. Col. iv. 16, Comp. I. Cor. i. 2; II. Cor. i. 1. On the epistles said to be to the Ephesians, and even that to the Romans, see Introduction, page 14 and 44, et seq.
11. Dion. of Cor. in Eus. II. E. iv. 23.
12. Justin Apol. i. 67, is a more advanced century.
13. Papias, in Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39.
14. Rom. xvi. 22.
15. Rom. xvi. 22. The passages Philemon 19, and Gal. vi. 11, do not imply that these two letters were altogether autograph; that would be, at any rate, exceptional.
16. For example, Rom. ii. 14, 15; I. Cor. viii. 1-3; Gal. ii. 6, 7; vi. 1. Cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* v. 1. As to the appearance of a letter of Paul's, see *Papyrus grès du Louvre et de la Bible imp.* in the *Notices et extraits*, vol. XVIII., second part pl. VI. et seq. or pl. xvii. (pap. 18 bis.) or pl. XLVI. or pl. LII.
17. For example, *ναυχαομαι* and its derivatives, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians.
18. II. Thess. ii. 2; Dionysius of Cor. in Eus. II. E. iv. 23.
19. Gal. vi. 11.
20. II. Thess. iii. 17; I. Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18, Comp. Gal. vi. 11, Cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* viii. 1. Suetonius *Tib.* 21, 32; Dion Cassius, lvi. 11; Cavedoni, *Le Salut. delle Epist. di S. Paolo* (extracts of vol. XVII, of the third part of *Mem. di reglig.* etc., printed at Modena), p. 12, et seq.
21. II. Thess. ii. 2, 14; iii. 14-17; I. Cor. v. 9; xvi. 1, 3; II. Cor. x. 9, et seq.; xi. 28; Col. iv. 10, 16. The collection, the edition if we can express it thus, of Saint Paul's letters was not made before the year 150 or 160. Papias and St. Justin had no knowledge of the Epistles of St. Paul.
22. *Χαρτης*, II. John 12, II. Tim. iv. 13, does not prove that the epistles were written on parchment. Parchment served particularly for books.
23. Clem. Roman, *Epist.* I. *ad Cor.* 47; Polycarp, *Ad Phil.* 3, Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* 12.
24. Dionysius of Cor. cited by Eus. II. E. iv. 23.
25. St. Peter, or the author of I. Peter, whoever he may be, had read or had before their eyes the Epistles to the Romans, the Epistle said to

be to the Ephesians, and the other Epistles of St. Paul. The authentic epistles, or apocryphal of Clement Roman, of Ignatius, of Polycarp, present also reminiscences of the Epistles of St. Paul. Clem. Rom. *Epist. ad Cor.* 24, 32, 34, 35, 37; Ignatius, *Ad Magnes.* 10, *Ad Ephes.* 18; *Ad Rom.* 3, 7; *Ad Phlad.* 1; *Ad Smyrn.* 6; Polycarp *Ad Philipp.*, very often.

26. I. Cor. vii. 1; viii. 1; xvi. 17; Phil. iv. 10, et seq.
7. The superscriptions and the contents of these letters, permit no doubt on this point.
23. That is certain, for the first. Comp. I. Thess. i. 7, 8; iii. 6; Acts xviii. 5. It has been sometimes supposed that the second was written from Berea. But II. Thess. i. 4; ii. 2; iii. 11, show that Paul had left Thessalonica some time before writing this epistle.
29. The second seemed to have been written first. The rule followed in the classification of St. Paul's letters bearing the same address, has always been to give the first place to the longest.
30. I. Thess. ii. 7.
31. I. Thess. ii. 11.
32. I. Thess. ii. 5; iii. 10.
33. II. Thess. iii. 4.
34. I. Thess. ii. 1, et seq.
35. I. Thess. i. 6; II. Thess. iii. 7, 9. Comp. Gal. iv. 12; I. Cor. iv. 16; x. 33; xi. 1.
36. Justin, *Apol.* i. 6, 7.
37. I. Thess. i. 6; iii. 4; II. Thess. i. 4, et seq.
38. Weak however, for in I. Cor. xii. 28, et seq., Paul knew but one superior in title, "the apostle." The faithful are classed by the spiritual gift which they exercised.
39. I. Thess. v. 12, 13.
40. II. Cor. i. 24.
41. *Πρεσβύτεροι*. Cf. the Jewish inscriptions, *Corp. inscr. gr.*, No. 9897, 9902 (*γερονδιαρχης*.)
42. *Χειροτονία*. See especially II. Cor. viii. 19.
43. Acts xiv. 23.
44. Acts xx. 28.
45. *Επίσκοποι*. Acts xx. 28; Philipp. i. 1, (and the explanations of St. John Chrysostom and of Theodoret on this last passage); I. Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 5, (St. Jerome on this passage,) 7. *Πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος*, are in the first century, synonyms. To translate these words by "priest," or "bishop," is as incorrect as to translate *imperator* "emperor," when it referred to the Roman republic. Comp. Acts xx. 17, 28.

46. See *les Apôtres*, p. 352, 353. On the *episcopi*, municipal magistrates, see Waddington, *Explic. des inscr.* of Le Bas. III. Nos. 1989, 1990, 2298.
47. Acts xx. 28, Cf. I. Peter II. 25.
48. Gal. vi. 6.
49. I. Thess. v. 14; Gal. v. 1, et seq.
50. Cf. the *Pastor* of Hermas. vis. II.; mand. IV.; simil. VII. VIII. X.
51. The Epistles to Timothy, which present them, are suppositional writings, and of a later date.
52. Compare the *nezifa* or admonition in the synagogue, among the Jews.
53. II. Thess. iii. 6, 14, 15; Gal. vi. 1; I. Cor. v. 13; II. Cor. ii. 6, et seq.
54. I. Thess. v. 16; Phil. ii. 1, 18; iii. 1; iv. 4.
55. Rom. i. 18, et seq.; Ephes. iv. 17-19; v. 12; I. Peter iv. 3.
56. Comp. Mischna. *Gittin*. v. 9, and the two Gèmares, on this passage.
57. II. Cor. vi. 14, vii. 1, express a contrary opinion. But this passage, not connected with that which precedes or that which follows, excites suspicions. It may, besides, be a precept appropriate to the particular situation of the Corinthians.
58. I. Cor. xv. 29; Tertullian *De resurr.*, *carnis*, 48; *Adv. Marc.* v. 10; Epiph. *hæar.* xxviii. 7; John Chrys. I. Cor. xv. 29. Compare for the analogous ceremonies of the Mormons, Remy. *Voy. au pays des Mormons*, p. 37, et seq.
59. I. Cor. vii. 14, Compare *Actes de sainte Perpetuë*, second vision.
60. I. Thess. iv. 1-8, Cf. the *Pastor* of Hermas, mand. IV.
61. See for example, the *Pastor* of Hermas, vis. I. and II.; simil. ix. 2, Comp. Eusebius, H. E. vii. 30.
62. Tatian, *Adv. Gr.* 33; Minutius Felix, Oct. 8, 9; Orig. *Contra Celsus*, iii. § 55; Cyrill, *Adv. Jul.* p. 229 (Paris 1638). Cf. of Rossi. *Bull.* 1864, p. 72.
63. Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum* entire, and especially *Ad uxorem*, ii. 3, and *De virginibus velandis*, 16, taking into consideration the exaggerated austerity peculiar to this writer.
64. Passages cited from Tatian, from Origen, and from St. Cyril. Cf. the *Pastor* of Hermas, vis. ii. 4.
65. I. Cor. vii. 1, et seq.; Justin, *Apol.* i. 15; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 33; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9, Orig.; *Contra Celsus*, I. §, 26. See all the legends of Thélca. Compare the *ἑπαὶ παρζενοι* of antiquity.
66. I. Tim. iii. 2, 12; Athenag. *Leg.* 33.
67. Cf. *notes and extracts*, xviii. second part, p. 422, 425.
68. See the inscriptions. For example Garrucci *Cimitero degli ant. Ebrei*, p. 68, eulogy of a Jewish woman who lived *μὴν ἀνδρὸς μετὰ παρ-δενιχοῦ ἀντῆς*. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 9905; de Rossi, *Roma sott.* I. *tav.* xxix. No. 1.

69. See the Jewish inscriptions published by Kirchoff and Garrucci, particularly the two beautiful inscriptions of Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 68.
70. See *code rabbinique* (of Joseph Karo, translated by MM. Sautayra and Charleville (Algiers 1868) I. p. 41, et seq.
71. I. Thess. iv. 9, 10. Cf. Joann. xiii. 34; xv. 12, 17; I. John iii. 10; iv. 12.
72. Gal. vi. 10.
73. I. Thess. iv. 11; II. Thess. iii. 10-13.
74. I. Thess. iv. 11; II. Thess. iii. 12.
75. I. Thess. iv. 11, 12, Comp. Col. iv. 5.
76. II. Thess. iii. 11, 12.
77. I. Thess. v. 19, 21.
78. I. Thess. i. 9; v. 15, et seq.
79. I. Cor. ii. 8; Jac. ii. 1.
80. I. Thess. i. 10, ii. 12-16; iii. 13; v. 23; II. Thess. i. 5, et seq.; ii. 1, et seq.
81. II. Thess. i. 5-10.
82. Comp. IV. book of Esdras, vi. verses 49, et seq. the oriental versions omitted in the Vulgate.
83. I. Thess. iv. 12, 17. Comp. IV. book of Esdras, vii. 28, et seq. Vulg. (see the Oriental versions published or collected by Ewald, Volkmar, Ceriani).
84. See "Life of Jesus," p. 276, et seq.
85. It must read κλέπτας, with the manuscript of the Vatican.
86. I. Thess. v. 1, et seq.
87. Compare Phil. ii. 6.
88. II. Thess. ii. 1-11.
89. See "Life of Jesus," p. 272, et seq.
90. This word is only found in the language of the epistle attributed to John. But the idea is perfectly characterized in St. Paul's epistles and the Apocalypse.
91. Cf. *Math.* xxiv. 24.
92. Daniel vii. 25; ix. 27; xi. 36. Targum of Jerus. Number xi. 26, and Deut. xxxiv. 2; Targ. of Jonathan, Is. xi. 4, etc.
93. Dan. xi. 36-39.
94. See "The Apostles," p. 193, et seq.; Philo, *Legatio ad Caium* § 25, et seq.; Jos. Ant. XVIII. viii.
95. The Apocalypse is full of such precautions.
96. Tacitus *Ann.* xii. 64, Suetonius, *Claudius*, 43 et seq. Dion Cassius, lx. 34, 35.
97. Compare the Apocalypse and Virg. *Georg.* I. 464, et seq.; compare the *Similitudes* of the book of Enoch, the IV. book of Esdras, book IV. of the Sibylline verses, the phenomena of the eruption of Vesuvius.
98. Col. iii. 17; iv. 2; Eph. v. 20.

99. I. Cor. x. 30, 31; Rom. xiv. 6; Col. iii. 17; Acts xxvii. 35, *Constit. apost.* vii. 49; Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39.
100. I. Cor. vi. 1, et seq.
101. This is the most probable meaning of I. Cor. vii. 21.
102. I. Cor. vii. 17-24; Col. iii. 22-25. Compare the conduct of the apostles towards Onesimus and Philemon.
103. I. Cor. xii.; xvi. Comp. Philo. (ut fertur) *De vita contempl.* § 10.
104. I. Cor. xiv. 30.
105. I. Cor. xii. 8-10, 28-30; xiv. 6, 15, 16, 26; Col. iii. 16.
106. Λογια Σεοῦ, I. Peter iv. 11.
107. Tertullian, *Apol.* 39; Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* ii. 165.
108. Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19; Tertullian, *loc. cit.*
109. I. Cor. xiv. 34.
110. I. Cor. xiv. 16, Justin *Apol.* i. 65, 67.
111. Latin mass.
112. This cry was used among the heathens, Arrian, *Epict. Dissert.* ii. 7.
113. I. Cor. xiv. 1, et seq.; Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 39, 82; Eusebius, H. E. v. 17, Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 6406.
114. Acts xxi. 9; Eusebius, l. c.; Maffei, *Mus. Veron.* p. 179.
115. Πνευματικῶι.
116. I. Cor. xii. 3, 10, 28, 30; xiv. 5, et seq.
117. I. Cor. xiv. 22, πνεῦμα is often compared with δύναμις, I. Cor. ii. 4, 5; Rom. xv. 19.
118. I. Cor. xiv. 23, 24.
119. I. Cor. xiv. 24, 25. See John iii. 20; "Life of Jesus," p. 162, compare the analogous customs which existed in Saint Simonism and which induced the most striking scenes. *Œuvres de Saint Simon et d'Enfantin*, v. (Paris, 1866) p. 152, et seq.
120. Acts xix. 18. See however, hereafter, note 68, Chap. XII.
121. I. Cor. xi. 20, et seq. Epistle of Jude 12.
122. I. Cor. xi. 23, et seq.; Justin *Apol.* i. 66.
123. I. Thess. v. 26; I. Cor. xvi. 20; II. Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16; I. Peter, v. 14; Justin, *Apol.* i. 65; *Constit. apost.* ii. 57; viii. 11; Clement of Alexandria, *Pædag.* iii. 11, Tertullian, *De oratione* 14; Lucian, *Lucius*, 17; Cyril of Jerus. *Catech. Myst.* v. 3 (Paris, 1720, p. 326). Cf. Genes. xxxiii, 4; II. Sam. xiv. 23; Luke xv. 20, where the kiss implies the idea of reconciliation. Cf. Suicer, *Thes. eccl.*, the words ἀσπίζομαι, ἀσπασμός, φιλημα; Ronandot, *Liturg. Oriental Coll.* I. p. 12, 26, 39, 60, 142, etc. The Latin Church transferred the kiss of peace after the communion, then suppressed or changed it.
124. *Constit. apost.* ii. 57; viii. 11; Council of Laodicea, Canon 19; treaty *Ad virginem lapsam*, attributed to Saint Ambrose, to St. Jerome,

- and to St. Augustin, ch. vi.; Amalaire, *De eccl. offic.* iii. 32; book *De offic. div.* attributed to Alcuin, c. xxxix. xl.; Haymon of Halberstadt, *In. Rom.* xvi. 16; G. Duranti, *Rationale*, I. iv. c. liii. No. 9.
125. Tertullian *Ad uxorem*, ii. 4.
126. Dion. Areop. *De eccl. hierarch.* ch. iii. contempl. 8.
127. Tertullian *De orat.* 14.
128. Acts ii. 46.
129. Acts xx. 7 et seq.; Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39.
130. Actual usage of the Friday evening.
131. Acts xx. 8; Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39. It is probable that the custom of celebrating the mysteries before sunrise, was in consequence of the persecutions. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 2; *Ad Uxorem* ii. 4; *De cor. mil.* 3; *De fuga in persec.* 14, Minutius Felix, *Oct.* 8, Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97, distinguish the reunion *ante lucem* from the reunion for the repast.
132. John xx. 26; Apoc. i. 10; I. Cor. xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7, 11, (The matter here under discussion occurred in the first part of the year 58.) Justin *Apol.* i. 67. Cf. Pliny *Epist.* x. 97.
133. Justin, *Apol.* i. 67.
134. I. Cor. xvi. 2; Justin, *Apol.* i. 67.
135. This is still the case among the Christians of Abyssinia; who have kept a tinge of Judean-Christianism. See Philoxène Luzzatto, *Mem. sur les Falashas*, p. 47. The single fact that the name of *Sabbat* remained in the Christian calendar, proves that for a long time, in the churches, Saturday was the day of rest.
136. Cf. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 10. The two uses are preserved simultaneously in some places. Conc. of Laodicia, canons 16, 29; St. Aug. *Epist.* liv. ad Januarium; Sozomèn *H. E.* vii. 19.
137. St. Jerome, *In Matth.* xii. init.
138. Acts ii. 46; xx. 7, 11; Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97; Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39, and the ancient eucharistic representations. Bosio, p. 364, 368; Bottari, tav. cxxvii (ii. p. 168, et seq.); tav. clxii (iii. 107 et seq.); Aringhi, ii. p. 77, 83, 119, 123, 185, 199, 267; Boldetti, p. 45, et seq.; Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.* iii. plates; Martigny, *Dict. des ant. chrét.* p. 245, et seq.; 401, 578, et seq.; de Rossi, *Roma. sott.* Vol. ii. pl. 14, 15, 16, 18; *Bullettino di arch. crist.* June, August and Oct., 1865.
139. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39.
140. See *les Apôtres*, p. 358, 359.
141. I. Cor. xi. 20.
142. Comp. the fresco of the cemetery of SS. Marcellin and Peter (Bottari, tav. cxxvii.) and a similar one found by M. di Rossi (Martigny, p. 579-580,) to the inscription of Laraviur, second col. lines 15-17. (Mommson, *De coll.* 78-111) Cf. Martial, I. i. 3; VIII. lxvii. 7; XIV. cv. 1.

143. Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97.
144. Ailinghi, *Roma subt.* ii. p. 119; Bottari, *tav.* cxxvii.
145. Tertullian, *Apol.* 39; Minutius Felix, *Oct.* 31; Eusebius, *Oratio Constantini*, 12.
146. Momm., figures before cited; Paulin de Perigueux. *Life of St. Martin*, iii. p. 1031 (Migne.); Martial. X. xlviii. 6; XIV. lxxxvii. 1; Lampride, *Heliog.* 25, 29; St. Pierre Chrysologue, *Sermons*, xxix.
147. Many of these saucers remain, from the close of the second century until the fourth. V. Filippo Buonarruoti, *Osservazioni sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetro*, Firenze, 1716; Garrucci, *Vetri ornati*, Roma, 1858; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 19, 278, et seq. 578.
148. Justin, *Apol.* i. 65-67.
149. I. Cor. xi. 22, 34.
150. See St. John Chrysostom, *In I. Cor.* xi. homil. xxvii. and the fresco of the cemetery of Saint Callista, in Pitra, *Spic. Sol.* iii. tab. i. fig. 2.
151. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* ii. 1.
152. This is what St. Paul wishes; I. Cor. xi. 18, et seq. Cf. Justin, *Apol.* i. 65-67.
153. Third council of Carthage, canons 24, 29, 30; St. Augustine, *Epist.* liv. *ad Jan.*; St. John Chrys., passage cited; Theophylactus and Theodoret. *In I. Cor.* xi.
154. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 39; the same, *De jejun.* 17; *Constit. apost.* ii. 28, 57, iii. 10; v. 19; Council of Gangres, canon 11, etc.
155. Council of Laodicea, canon 28; third council of Carthage, canons 24, 29, 30. St. Augustine, St. Ambrose are here very contradictory.
156. St. Gregory of Naz. *Orat.* iv. (i. in Jul.) § 84; Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 17, and the antique glasses described by Buonarruoti and Garrucci.
157. Greg. of Tours. *Hist. eccl. Fr.* vi. 5; viii. 2; *Vita. S. Melanii*, c. 4, (*Acta SS.* 6 jan.).
158. Epistle of Jude, 12. Comp. II. Pet. ii. 13, Cf. Sancti Ignatii (ut fertur) *Epist. ad Smyrn.* 8 (edit. Petermann); Clem. of Alex. *Pædag.* ii. 1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 39; the same, *De jejun.* 17; *Constit. apost.* ii. 28.
159. See "*Vie de Jesus*," thirteenth edition, p. 316; *les Apôtres*, p. 81-82.
160. Justin, *Apol.* i. 66; Garrucci, *Tre sepolcri*, Naples, 1852.
161. Justin, *l. c.* (cf. Tertullian, *De jej.* 16). The hesitation which could be produced in regard to the tomb of Vibia is the best commentary on the passage of Justin.
162. Justin. *Dial. cum Tryph.* 10; Minutius Felix, 8, 9, 28, 30, 31; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 3; Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* iii. 4, 5, letter from the churches of Vienna and of Lyons in Eus. *H. E.* v. 1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 2; *Ad uxorem*, ii. 4, Cf. Juvenal, xv. 1-13.
163. I. Cor. xvi. 8.
164. In consequence of Acts xviii. 21 (according to Griesbach and the received text).

165. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26; v. 23-25; *Chronique pascale*, p. 6, et seq. edit. Du Cange. They attach to this also the creation of the world, which they supposed to have taken place at the Spring equinox. Murinus Alex., in Pitra, *Spic. Sol.*, I. p. 14.
166. I. Cor. v. 7, 8. Cf. Gal. iv. 9-11; Rom. xiv. 5; Col. ii. 16.
167. I. Cor. xvi. 8; Acts xx. 16.
168. Acts ii. 1.
169. There is no trace of this interpretation before the Talmud. Talm. of Bab. *Pesachim*, 68 b.
170. See Macarius Magnes, cited by Nicephorus, in Pitra, *Spicil. Sol.* i. 309, et seq. The paintings of the catacombs, except when they are much later than the first century, are decorative, and do not pretend to present objects of worship. The Oriental Church still repels sculpture as tainted with idolatry.
171. I. Cor. xvi. 19; Rom xvi. 5. 14, 15, 23; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2; Acts xx. 8, 9.
172. *Περὶ ὧν*. Acts i. 13; ix. 37, 39; xx. 8, 9.
173. *Ibid.*
174. Inscr. in Mom. *De coll. et sod. Rom.* p. 78, note 25, 96; in de Rossi *Rom. Sott.* p. 209; Fabretti *Inscr. domest.* p. 430, et seq., p. 146, No. 178; Orelli 2414, 4938; Gruter, 1117, 7; Amaduzzi, *Anecd. litt.* 1, p. 476. Nos. 39, 40; Pliny, *Epist.* VIII, 16.
175. Thus Ephesus, which had at least three peculiar churches (Rom. xvi. 5, 14, 15,) made none the less one and the same church. Corinth had, it seems, but one particular church (Rom. xvi. 23, Greek text).
176. Acts ii. 22.
177. I. Cor. viii. 6.
178. Coloss. i. 16; John i. 3. Cf. Philo. *De Cherubim*, § 35.
179. II. Cor. iv. 4.
180. II. Cor. v. 18-21.
181. II. Cor. v. 17.
182. II. Cor. v. 14, 15.
183. II. Cor. viii. 9.
184. II. Cor. xiii. 4.
185. II. Cor. i. 12.
186. II. Cor. iv. 10-12.
187. II. Cor. iii. 18.
188. II. Cor. iv. 16; v. 8.
189. II. Cor. iv. 7.
190. II. Cor. i. 14; v. 10.

CHAPTER X.

1. Thess. ii. 14.
2. Acts xviii. 21, according to the reading of Griesbach, which is also that of the received text. The omission of this passage explains itself, but its interpolation is not so clear. It is true that Gal. i. and ii. would lead to the belief that Paul made no journey to Jerusalem between his first and second missions. Strictly speaking, we may doubt the reality of this journey, as of the one reported in Acts xi. 30; xii. 25. But it seems that the author of the Acts believes it, or wishes to convey this belief.
3. Jos. B. J. II. xv. 1.
4. Acts xviii. 18. *Κεῖράμενος* can only relate to Paul, if it is adopted for the v. 21, reading of Griesbach. Why does Aquila make this vow, when he does not go to Jerusalem? Why, at least, does the author of the Acts speak of it?
5. Acts xviii. 21, reading of Griesbach.
6. Acts xviii. 22. In consequence of the use of the two expressions, *ἀναβὰς* and *χαρτεβῆ* (cf. *Recognit.* iv. 35), and especially verses 18 and 19.
7. The author of the Acts seems to fear to urge the point. The text here is full of ambiguities and of hiatuses.
8. Gal. II. ii. 10.
9. This results from the silence that Paul kept with regard to this voyage, in the Epistle to the Galatians (see especially ii. 10, 11.)
10. I. Cor. ix. 5; Clem. Rom. *Epist.* I. *ad Cor.* 5.
11. Gal. ii. 7, et seq.
12. Gal. ii. 7, 11, et seq.
13. I. Cor. ix. 5; Clem. of Alex. *Strom.* vii. 11; Eus. H. E. iii. 30.
14. Papias in Eus. H. E. iii. 39; Irenæus *Adv. hæc.* III. i. 1; x. 6; Clement of Alex., cited by Eus. H. E. ii. 15; Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5.
15. I. Peter v. 13. If, as we have supposed, the *παροξυσμός* of Acts xv. 39, answers to the incident reported in Gal. ii. 11, et seq., it would be much more natural to admit that Peter had John-Mark at Antioch with him. It is at Antioch, moreover, that a *ἐρμηνευτής* would have been most necessary to him.
16. *Homilies or Recognitions*, pseudo-Clementine.
17. Clem. Rom. I. *ad Cor.* 5.
18. Gal. ii. 11.
19. In the year 58, Peter is absent from Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 18.
20. Libanius *Antiochicus*, p. 360, 361 (Reiske).
21. I. Cor. ix. 5, et seq.
22. Cf. The Pastor of Hermas, vis i. and ii.; Eusebius H. E. vii. 30; Council of Nice, canon 3; law of Arcadius and of Honorius, in the code Just. I. iii. 19; St. Jerome Epist. ad Eustochium, *De cust. virg.*

23. *Constit. apost.* vi. 14; Clement of Alexandria, cited by Eus. II. E. ii. 1; Eus. *ibid.* ii. 23; iii. 22, iv. 5, vii. 19, St. Jer. *In Gal.* i. 19.
24. Letter of Clement to James, at the head of the pseudo-Clementine homilies, title; homily xi. 35.
25. *Gal.* ii. 7, et seq.
26. According to Epiphanius (*hæc.* lxxviii. 14), James would have been 96 years old at his death, which occurred in the year 62. James would then have been born in the year 34 B.C., or about 30 years before Jesus, which is very difficult if Jesus and he were of the same mother.
27. See *Life of Jesus*, p. 24, 25, 153, 154. I am now inclined to believe that the "brethren of the Lord" were from a former marriage of Joseph.
28. We suspend the question as to whether this James is identical with James son of Alphaeus, or the younger, one of the twelve. The question is not of much importance for our subject, since, in the hypothesis of the difference between the two persons, James, the son of Alphaeus, the apostle, remains altogether obscure. As to James the son of Zebedee, or James the elder, his person stands out from his namesake's with perfect clearness.
29. See p. 74, et seq.
30. Epistle of Jude 8, et seq.
31. *Gal.* i. 7; ii. 12, etc. Comp. Acts xv. 1, 24. We will show later the continuation of this counter-mission, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and in the rôle which the author of the Homilies (*pseudo-Clementine*) gives to Peter, a rôle which consists in following the steps of Simon the Magician, to thwart his predictions and to repair the evil that he did. See especially hom. ii. 17.
32. See, for example, the works of Saint Simon and of Enfantin vii. p. 178, et seq.
33. This can be inferred from I. Peter v. 12. But the identity of the Sylvanus named in this passage, with the companion of Saint Paul, is doubtful.
34. Notice his rôle, Acts xv. 22, et seq.
35. See *The Apostles*, introd.
36. *Gal.* ii. 13. On the hypothesis that the meeting of Peter and Paul at Antioch, took place on this journey.
37. Titus disappeared after the return of Paul to Antioch, who followed the council to Jerusalem. He re-appeared during the third mission. It is then probable that Paul overtook him at Antioch, on his departure for the third mission.
38. *Gal.* II. 11, et seq. Cf. *pseudo-Clem. Homilies* xvii. 19, and the pretended letter of Peter to James, under the head of Homilies 2. It is more natural to place the incident in question at this date, than at the pre-

ceding visit of Paul to Antioch. The agreement of Jerusalem was then too recent. Besides, that which is said in verse 13 makes it evident that Barnabas was no longer under the influence of Paul when this incident occurred. Of the three parts that we can here take to make the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians agree: First, to transport the incident (Gal. ii. 11, et seq.) to the interval between the first and second missions; second, to deny the journey to Jerusalem after the second mission, notwithstanding Acts xviii. 18, 21, 22; third, to insert this voyage after Gal. ii. 10, although Paul does not speak of it; this last part is even the less confusing. As to the different means which the Fathers, since Clement of Alexandria, have imagined to excuse or to extenuate the episode of Antioch, they are absolutely gratuitous, not being founded on the text nor on any particular tradition.

39. Gal. ii. 12; II. Cor. iii. 1, et seq.; v. 12; x. 12, 18; xii. 11. Compare *τινες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου; . . . χρῆζομεν ὡς τινες οὐστιατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν; . . . τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων.*
40. Comp. Gal. ii. 2.
41. Comp. Apoc. ii. 2; xxi. 14.
42. *Recognitions pseudo-Clem.* iv. 34, 35; comp. *Homily xi.* 35, et seq., and the attestations of James (at the head of the Hom.) 1 and 2. Cf. Acts xv. 22, et seq., where the author admits the principle of the *ἐπιστόλη οὐστιατική*, and takes advantage of it for his party. Cf. *Const. apost.* ii. 58.
43. II. Cor. xi., xii.; Apoc. ii. 2. In a compilation of the *Acta Petri et Pauli*, published by Thilo (Halle, 1837 and 1838), where the Ebionite tinge is still obvious, Peter is informed by the bishops of Paul's doctrine, and recognizing that this last has ceased to be inimical to the law, gives him his approbation (ch. Baur. *Paulus* i. 260, 261, 2d edit.). In the compilation published by Tischendorf, § 60 (*Acta Ap. apocr.*), this shade is effaced.
44. Ex. xxxiii. 11, et seq.; Num. xii. 6.
45. Homilies pseudo-Clem. xvii. 13-20.
46. Gal. ii. 11, et seq.
47. See *Life of Jesus*, p. 395, 396. Compare the legend *Domine quo vadis*, mentioned for the first time in a decided manner by St. Ambrose, but which seems much more ancient. Cf. Origen, *Comment. in Joh.*, tomus xx. § 12, edit. of La Rue.
48. Gal. ii. 11, et seq. Cf. the *Κήρυγμα Παύλου* quoted by the anonymous author of the *De non iter. bapt.*, among the *Observationes* of Rigault, at the sequel of the works of St. Cyprian, p. 139.
49. Comp. Gal. vi. 13. According to Saint Paul's idea no one is capable of observing the whole law; even those most interested fail in it.

50. Gal. ii. 11.
51. Gal. i. 18; ii. 2. Cf. the *Κηρυγμα Παύλου*, l. c.
52. *Constit. apost.* vii. 46.
53. Pseudo-Clem. Homilies xvii. 19; Letter from Peter to James, at the head of these homilies, § 2.
54. Pseudo-Clem. Homilies xvii. 13-19 (see ch. x., 71, note); Irenæus, *Adv. hæc.* l. xxvi. 2; Clem. of Alex., in *Eus. II. E.*, vi. 14; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 27; Epiphanius *Adv. hæc.* xxx. 16, 25; St. Jerome, *De viris ill.*, 5. In Matt. xii. init.; Primasius; in the *Max. Bibl. Patrum* (Lugd.), x. p. 144. The hostility of Papias (*Eus. II. E.* iii. 39) and of Hegesippus to Paul is foreseen. Cf. Photius cod. ccxxxii. p. 288 (Bekker), where Hegesippus, like the author of the Homilies, seems to refute Paul's claim to a special revelation. Note, however, (in *Eus. II. E.* iii. 32; iv. 22) the system of Hegesippus in regard to the virgin church, not polluted before the death of James by ἀνοῶς ματαίαις. It is true, that he caused by εἰ καὶ τινες ὑπῆρχον, a restriction in which Paul was perhaps included. St. Justin even seems to have had little favor for the apostle. He does not name him, and attributes to the "twelve" the evangelization of the Gentiles. In one place (*Dial. cum Tryph.* 35; comp. I. Cor. viii. x.), he contradicts the apostle directly. Neither does Polycrates of Ephesus cite Saint Paul. In the controversy of the Passover, the only apostolic authority alleged is that of Saint John.
55. See the epistle to the Galatians entire.
56. Jud. 4, 7, 8, 10, 23. Notice the reproach of πορνεία; it is that which is always applied to the doctrine of Paul. Comp. Jude 7 and Apoc. ii. 14, 20.
57. This relates to a longer epistle, which we have not.
58. Allusion to the passage, Gen. vi. 1, et seq., explained in the book of Enoch c. vi. et seq.
59. That is to say, the apostles of Jerusalem. We will readily admit that there is then an allusion to the scene related Gal. 2. 11, et seq., if we imagine that it relates to the same scene in the Homilies (*pseudo-Clementine*), xvii. 19.
60. Allusion to an apocryphal book entitled the "Assumption of Moses." Cf. Helgenfeld *Novum Testamentum Extra canonem receptum*, i. p. 95, et seq.
61. Jude here opposes the relative moderation of Satan to the impertinence of Paul, who dares to treat Peter as χατεγνωσμένος. Cf. Homilies pseudo-Clement., xvii. 19.
62. Cf. Acts viii. 18, et seq. See p. 301.
63. Cf. Apoc. ii. 14, and II. Pet. ii. 15.
64. Enoch i. 9 (division of Dillmann).

65. Apoc. ii. 9; iii. 9.
66. Apoc. ii. 2.
67. Apoc. ii. 20.
68. Jude 11; II. Pet. ii. 15; Apoc. ii. 2, 6, 14, 15.
69. Apoc. ii. 20.
70. Homil. pseudo-Clem. ii. 17.
71. There is no doubt that, under the character of Simon the Magician, the author of the pseudo-Clem. Homilies means often to designate Paul. See especially Hom. xvii. § 19; ἀνθεστηχάς μοι, and the passage Πείχαιτε γνωσόμενον με λέγεις . . . are evidently an allusion to Gal. ii. 11, and i. 16. Comp. also Hom. xvii. 12-17 to I. Cor. xii. 1, (ὀπτασίας, ἀποκαλυψείς); Hom. ii. 17, to Acts xxi., 28. The pseudo-Clem. Homilies appeared at Rome towards the year 150 or 160. For their hostile character towards Saint Paul, see esp. Hom. ii. 17; iii. 59; vii. 48; *Recogn.* iv. 36; Epistle of Peter to James (at the head of Hom.), 2; *attestation (ibid.)*.
72. Homilies pseudo-Clem. iii. 59.
73. Comp. an analogous etymology to *Balaam*: Talm. of Bab. *Sanhédrin* 105 a. A vague relation between *Balaam* and *Nicolas* or *Onkelos* is found even in the Talmud: *Gittin*, 57, a cf. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* six years (p. 36, 37). Compare the name *Armillus* to Ἐρμούλαος, given to the Antichrists among the Jews.
74. See 183, 184.
75. Num. xxxi. 16; Jos. Ant. IV. vi, 6. For the association of ideas which the Jewish-Christians established around πορνεία, see the passages of Apocalypse and of the Epistle of Jude, before quoted, without forgetting Acts xv. 20; xxi. 25, and Gal. v. 19-21. This πορνεία in relation with Balaam, is the electric spark which spreads in darkness the current of hate against Paul.
76. Later in Judaism, Jesus (more or less confounded with Paul) was sometimes, as it seems, designated in hidden words by this same name of Balaam. Mischna, *Sanhédrin*, xi. 1, and the Gémare of Jerusalem corresponding; Mischna *Aboth.* v. 19; Siphre, near the end; Talm. of Bab., *Gittin* 57 a (cf. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 6th year, p. 31, et seq.).
77. Apoc. 11, 6, 14, 14, 15,
78. *Recognitions* i. 70, 71.
79. Homil. pseudo-Clem. ii. 17,
80. Irenæus *Adv. hæc.* I. xxvi. 2.
81. Letter of Peter to James, under the head of Homilies pseudo-Clementine § 2. Cf. Hom. xvii. 19.
82. Hom. ii. 17; iii. 59.
83. Letter of Peter to James, § 2.

84. Apoc. ii. 24. Cf. Cor. ii. 10.
85. Apoc. ii. 9; iii. 9.
86. Apoc. xxi. 14; cf. xviii. 20.
87. Allusion to this: Apoc. ii. 9. Cf. II. Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5.
88. Comp. *Masseket Gerim* c. i (édit. Kirchheim).
89. Epiph. hæ. xxx. 16.
90. Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. ii. 23; Letter of Clement to James, under the head of Homilies, pseudo-Clementine, title; Epiph. hæ. xxx. 16; lxxviii. 7.
91. There certainly exists an Ebionite legend of Saint James, of which Hegesippus and Saint James conserve to us the substance and some extracts.
92. The epistle attributed to him has much this character.
93. Epiph. hæ. xxxix. 4; lxxxviii. 13.
94. Ex. xxxix. 6.
95. Epiph. hæ. xxix. 4; lxxviii. 14. John, after the death of the other apostles, the high priest of the Jewish-Christians, was decorated with the same insignia. Polycrates in Eusebius, H. E. iii. 31; v. 24; passage which forbids us regarding that which Epiphanius said of the *πεταλον* to James, as a purely Jewish-Christian fable.
96. Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. ii. 23; Epiph. hæ. xxix. 4; lxxviii. 13.
97. Epiph. hæ. lxxviii. 13.
98. Récognit. pseudo-Clem. i. 43; Constit. apost. viii. 35; Eusèbe. H. E. vii. 19; Epiph. hæ. lxxviii. 7; John Chrys. Hom. xxxviii. in I. Cor. xv. 7, p. 355 of the edit. of Montfaucon.
99. Hegesippus and Epiphanius, place cited. Comp. the passage on Saint James, given to Jos. by Origen, Eus. and Saint Jerome (Eus. H. E. ii. See note 57, Chap. III.
100. See Chap. III. note 46.
101. I. Cor. iv. 4.
102. I. Cor. i. 9.
103. I. Cor. x. 16. et seq.; xi. 23, et seq.
104. I. Cor. i. 30.
105. I. Cor. ii. 8.
106. I. Cor. xv. 21, et seq.
107. I. Cor. 27, 28.

CHAPTER XI.

1. Gal. i. 7, 8; v. 10. These three verses compared prove that in the emissaries, Paul saw the action of the chief of the church of Jerusalem. Compare the *τινές* of Gal. i. 7, to *τινές ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* (Gal. ii. 12,) to *τινές* of II. Cor. iii. 1. x. 12; to *τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας* of Acts xv. 1.

2. Gal. vi. 12, et seq.
3. Gal. v. 11. Compare I. Cor. v. 16. See note 52, Chap. II.
4. Gal. v. 15, 26. When Saint Paul wrote this epistle, he had been twice in Galatia (iv. 13). That prevents our imagining the date of this epistle to be in the third mission. Again, the incident Gal. ii. 11, et seq., seems not to have taken place at the time of the second mission, and if the epistle had been written during this mission, we should find as in the epistles to the Thessalonians, the name of Silas which was known to the Galatians since the commencement of the second voyage. The vague formula Gal. i. 2, applies well with Antioch. The promptitude with which Paul learned the incident, and replied to it, shows a certain facility of communication; but communication with the eastern centre of Asia Minor was easier from Antioch (by Tarsus) than from Ephesus.
5. For the distinction of *σάρκι καὶ αἵματι*, com. Matt. xvi. 17.
6. Gen. xv. 6.
7. Allusion to the tunic which they put on, emerging from baptism.
8. A proverb familiar to Saint Paul. I. Cor. v. 6.
9. It appears that some of Paul's adversaries, caring more to attack him than to be consistent, expressed themselves as follows: "After all, this pretended apostle of the Gentiles preaches also sometimes circumcision."
10. Pleasantry. See Phil. iii. 2, et seq.
11. Gal. vi. 11, *Πηλικοί γραμμασίν* does not necessarily imply the idea of "large letters."
12. That is to say: to raise one's self in the eyes of Jewish society by a carnal advantage much esteemed by them.
13. That is: to gain influence among the Jews by presenting the newly circumcised as so many conquests.
14. He repeats himself without seeing it. Comp. v. 6; comp. also I. Cor. vii. 19.
15. The sincere circumcised Christians, in opposition to "Israel according to the flesh," the Jews who drew vanity from the circumcision.
16. The traces of blows from the scourge and the rod he had received, which made him resemble Jesus crucified.
17. Gal. i. 2.
18. Comp. Col. iv. 16.
19. I. Cor. xvi. 1.
20. Saint Jerome's letter to Saint Augustine (col. 623 Martanay).
21. Apoc. xxi. 14.
22. Hence the tone of the book of Acts. See *the Apostles*, introd. p. iv. v.
23. Dionysius of Corinth, in Eus. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 25.

24. Justin. *Apol.* i. 39, 45. *Dial. cum Tryph.* 42, 53; Homil. pseudo-Clem. iii. 59; letter of Clement to James, at the head of Hom. § I. Comp. Acts. x.
25. Gal. iv. 17; vi. 13.
26. Justin knew nothing certain of the convention Gal. ii. 7-10, since he regarded the conversion of Gentiles as the work of the twelve (*Apol.* i. 39).
27. Gal. i. 15 et seq.
28. We have a striking example in Cor. xi. 23.

CHAPTER XII.

1. Acts xviii. 23.
2. Gal. iv. 20.
3. See Chap. X., note 37.
4. In one sense even, for the fourth time since on his first mission, Paul passed again through each one of the cities that he had evangelized.
5. Acts xviii. 23.
6. Acts xx. 4.
7. Gal. iv. 16, 20.
8. This is clear from Acts. xx. 31, compared with I. Cor. xxi. 8.
9. *Φρυγίαν*. Acts xviii. 23. Compare Strabo, XIV. ii. 29.
10. Col. ii. 1.
11. Strabo, XII. viii. 16, 17; XIV. ii. 29.
12. *τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη*. Acts xix. 1.
13. Iliad ii. 461.
14. Hom. *Iliad*, ii. 459, and following; Virg. *Aen.* vii. 699 and following; Ovid. *Met.* v. 386, and following.
15. That of *Aia-Solouk*. See Edward Falkener, *Ephesus* (London 1862,) p. 119 &c., 149 &c., and the plans; see also the chart of the *Hydrographic Office* (1836); Laborde, *Voy. de l'Asie Min.* pl. xlv. xlv. and Svoboda, *Remains of the Seven Churches of Asia* (Photographed), Nos. 11, 26 (London, 1867). According to a Greek Synaxis, cited by Arundell, *Discoveries*, ii. 253, this hill was called *Helibaton*. Not having been able to verify this text, I am afraid that *ἡλίβατον* is simply an epithet of the hill. Compare Pococke, *De aedif.* v. 1.
16. Jos. *Ant.* XIV. x. 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 25; XVI. vi. 4. 7; Philo. *Leg.* § 40.
17. Compare in our days Marseilles, Leghorn, Trieste.
18. Strabo, XIV. i. 25; Diog. Laert. IX. i. 1.
19. Athenaeus, xii. 28, 29.
20. Herodotus V. liv. 1 and 2, Plut. Life of Lysander, 3.

21. The priests had the title of kings (Paus. VIII. xiii. 1). The name of the high priest is sometimes seen on the coins. Vaillant, *Numism. gr. imp. Rom.* p. 310, 313; Eckhel. D. n. v. ii. 518, 519. Compare *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2954, 2987, 2987b, 3002, 3003; Tac. *Ann.* iii. 62.
22. *Panionia and Oecumenica, Artemisia, Ephesia, Bacchanalia, Balbillia, Lucullia.* Compare *Corpus. inscr. Gr.* No. 2954.
23. Strabo, XIV. i. 23.
24. Strabo, XIV. i. 20-23; Tac. *Ann.* iii. 61; Isidore of Pelus, *Epist.* ii. 62; Plut. *An seni sit. resp.* 24; *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2954, 2955, 2963c, 2983, 2990.
25. Strabo, XII. viii. 15; XIV. i. 24; Plutarch, *Life of Lys.* 3.
26. *Ποδοχεῖον κοινόν.* Strabo, XII. viii. 15. The port where Aquila and Priscilla, Paul and John probably landed, is now a pond covered with reeds.
27. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2957 et seq.
28. *Φιλοσεβαστός, Corpus inscr. gr.* 2961 b, 2966, 2972, 2987, 2987 b, 2990, 2993, 2999, 3001; *φιλοκαίσαρ*, 2975.
29. Plut. "Life of Alex." 3; Artemidorus of Ephesus, *Oneirocritica*; Maximus of Ephesus in the fourth century. Cf. *Corpus insc. gr.* No. 2953.
30. Philostratus, *Apoll.* iv. 2.
31. Herodotus, VIII. cv. 2; Strabo, XIV. i. 23; Philostratus, *Apoll.* iv. 2.
32. Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* vii. 1.
33. Acts xix. 19, 23, et seq.
34. "The Matron of Ephesus"; *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus; *Charéas et Callirrhôe* of Chariton of Aphodisias.
35. Plut. *Life of Anthony*, 24, et seq.; Philostratus, *Apoll.* iv. 2; Pseudo-Heraclitus, letter vii.
36. Philostratus, *Apoll.* iv. 2.
37. Philostratus, *Apoll.* iv. 10.
38. There were, however, some true *savants* of Ephesus; Pliny, *Hist. nat.* xxxvii. 9; later, Rufus of Ephesus, Soranus.
39. Suetonius, *Nero*, 36; Dion Cassius, lxi. 9.
40. Chandler, *Travels*, I. ch. xxv; Falkener, *Ephesus*, p. 111. See, however, Guhl. *Ephesiaca*, p. 178, 181.
41. Rom. xvi. 5. I adopt the hypothesis after that of Rom. xvi. 3-20, is a fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians: First, because it is altogether improbable that Aquila, Priscilla, and Epenetus were at Rome when the epistle to the Romans was written; Second, because we cannot conceive how Paul should salute so many persons, having had relations with him, in a city where he had never been; Third, because the xv.-xvi. chapters, if they are similar, present four endings and a distribution contrary to the usages of Paul. See the introduction, p. 40, et seq.

42. Acts xviii. 24, et seq.
43. I. Cor. xvi. 19. The words *Apud quos et hospitor* do not occur in the Greek, but the fact in question results from the uniformity of the verse.
44. Phil. *Life of Alcib.* 12; Athenæus, xii. 47.
45. The rich Ephesian villas seem to have been on the route from Ephesus to Magnesia, and not on this side. [Communication of M. Hyde Clarke.]
46. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39; v. 24; *Synaxis* before cited; Procopius, *De ædif.* v. 1; Ibn-Batoutah, edition Defremery and Sanguinetti, ii. p. 308-309; Arundell, *Discov.* ii. p. 252, et seq.; Hamilton, *Res.* ii. 23.
47. The modern name of Ephesus, Aia-Solouk, seems to come from *Ἀϊα Θεολογόν*. It is true that they often pronounce and write *Aïashlyk* (Arundell 2, 252,) from which one is tempted to see the Turkish termination *lyk*, but the correct orthography is Solouk. (See Ibn-Batoutah, ii. p. 308.) Compare *Dara Soluk*, near Sardis. The gate which gives entrance to the citadel, may date from the Christian epoch. They used Pagan sculpture, which they interpreted in a Christian sense.
48. The presence of two churches among the ruins of ancient Ephesus, proves that it was still inhabited in the fourth and fifth centuries. However, if Christian Ephesus, with its important buildings, had existed around Prion and Coressus, more traces of it would have remained.
49. The beautiful mosque of Aïa-Solouk can in no way be identified with the basilica of St. John, notwithstanding the tradition of the Greeks of Tchirkindgi. [Communication of M. Hyde Clarke.] The regularity of the plan of the Mosque relative to the *Mihrab* suffices to prove that it was built as a mosque. An Arabic inscription establishes besides, that it was finished in 1569 [communication of M. Waddington], v. Falkener, p. 153, et seq. Nothing leads to the supposition that the mosque was built on the site of the basilica. The basilica was situated on a hill *Synaxis* before cited, and Procopius. *l. c.* I do not doubt that the basilica occupied the area of the citadel of Aïa-Solouk. The passage of Ibn-Batoutah on the churches of Ephesus is too vague for us to decide anything from it.
50. Aïa-Solouk has regained within a few years a little importance, as temporary head of the railroad from Smyrna to Aidin.
51. Acts xix. 1-5.
52. Hesychius, *s. h. v.* Suidas, *s. h. v.*, *Prov. græc. e Vatic, Bibl. append.* cent. i. 95 in the *Adagia* of Schott, Antwerp, 1612); *Corpus param. gr.* i. p. 244; ii. p. 169, Plut. *Quæst. convi.* VII. v. 4; Athenæus, xii. 70; Clem. of Alex. *Strom.* i. 15; v. 8; Pausanias, cited in Eustathius *ad Odyss.* xix. 247; Stephani, in the *Mel. greco-rom.* taken

from the *bull. of the Acad. of Saint Peters.*, b. I. p. 1, et seq. Frœhner in the *Bulletin de la Soc. des antiv. de Norm.* 7th year, p. 217, et seq. The use made in the Orient of the names of the "Seven Sleepers of Ephesus," as talismans, and a sequel to the *Ephesia Grammata*.

53. Acts xix. 13, et seq.
54. Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* iii. sub fin.
55. Acts xix. 8, et seq.
56. The best manuscripts omit *τινος*.
57. Justin. *Dial. cum Typh.* 1 (cf. Eus. H. E. iv. 18); Philostr. Apoll. iv. 3; viii. 26; Falkener *Eph.* plans of the three Gymnasiums. Cf. Vitruv. V. x. 4. Compare the gigantic *Schools* still extant at Hierapolis.
58. This name was not very rare, II. Macch. iv. 40; Jos. *Ant.* XVI. x. 3, B. J. I. xxvi. 3; Eus. H. E. VIII. xxxii. 3; Le Bas. *Inscr.* iii. No. 1439, Suidas (at the word *Τυραννος*) mentions a Sophist of that name, but with no indication of place nor of date.
59. Acts xx. 20.
60. Acts xx. 20, 31.
61. Acts xx. 21.
62. Acts xix. 12.
63. Cf. Justin. *Dial. cum Tryph.* 85; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, i. 25.
64. The number "Seven" (Acts xix. 14,) is doubtless induced by the number of which a demoniac legion was usually composed, (Matt. xii. 45; Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 2; xi. 26). On the vague meaning of *ἀρχιεργς*, cf. Schleusner, s. h v.; *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 6406 and perhaps 6363.
65. Compare Josephus, *Ant.* VIII. ii. 5.
66. These sorts of epidemics of demonology are not rare in the Orient. Some years ago, there were at one time in the little village of Saïda, more than three hundred persons engaged in occult sciences.
67. This often happened to me in Syria. The treasure-seekers, taking me for a comrade, when some circumstance more or less trifling had convinced them of my superiority, would come to communicate to me their talismans and their proceedings.
68. The sense of *πραξεις*, (v. 18) is determined by *πραξιατων* (v. 19,) and the sense of this last word by *περιεργα*. On the meaning of *περιεργα* as synonym of *γοητινά* see Aristenetus I. ii. ep. xviii.; Irenæus *Adv. hæc.* I. xxiii. 4. Cf. Du Cange at the word *Vanitas*.
69. Acts xix. 13-19.

CHAPTER XIII.

1. Acts xx. 20, 21.
2. I. Cor. xvi. 9.
3. Apoc. ii. 2.
4. I. Cor. xv. 32 (on the meaning of *θηριομαχεῖν*, comp. Ignatius, *Epist. ad Rom.* 5; Heb. x. 33; II. Tim. iv. 17); xvi. 4, 7; II. Cor. i. 8. et seq. The Pseudo-Heraclitus (letter vii. lines 50, 58-60, Bernays, who wrote towards this time, also presents the Ephesians as beasts), ἐξ ἀνθρώπων θηρία γεγονότες.
5. Like the incident, Acts xix. 23 et seq. We cannot, however, identify the incident, I. Cor. xv. 32, and xvi. 9, with the incident, Acts xix. 23, et seq.; this being of the last days that St. Paul passed at Ephesus, and he not having acted bravely there.
6. Rom. xvi. 4.
7. I. Cor. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 26; Apoc. i. 4, 11.
8. Epistles supposed to be from St. Ignatius to the Trallians.
9. All these cities, except Sardis, are still of more or less importance.
10. Cic. *Pro Flacco*, 28; Jos. *Ant.* XII. iii. 4; XIV. x. 11, 14, 20, et seq.; XVI. vi. 2, 4, 6; Acts ii. 9.
11. See the ignoble concourse of villany, related by Tacitus, *Ann.* IV. 55, 56. Note the titles of *θεὸς σύγκλητος*, *ιερά σύγκλητος*, given to the Roman Senate in this province. Waddington, *Voyage numismatique*, p. 8, 23, etc; the same, *Explication des inscriptions*, of Le Bas, III. p. 142; *Numismatic chronicle*, new series, vol. vi., p. 119.
12. Impression of the Greek quarter of Smyrna, on Sunday. (Observe that cities, even when there have been long gaps in their existence, have a spirit always more or less peculiar to themselves, which causes them again as they were.)
13. On the function of the Asiarchs, see Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscr.* III. Nos. 5. 158 a, 649, 885; Churchill Babington, in *Numism. chron.*, new series, vol. vi. p. 93, et seq., Strabo, XIV. i. 42; Ælius Aristides, *Sacr.* VI. 531; Acts xix. 31; Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, 12; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 2912, 3148, 3190, 3191, 3213, 3324, 3421, 3426, 3495, 3504, 3665, 3677; Vaillant, *Num. gr. imp. rom.* p. 312, 313, Mionnet. II. 549, 617; III. 61, 250; IV. 55, 128, 140, 328, 347, 362, suppl. V. 276, 505. There were likewise *bithynarchs*, *pontarchs*, and *galataarchs*, etc. Cf. Le Bas. III. Nos. 1178, 1221, 1224, Perot, *Expl. of the Gal.* p. 199, et seq.
14. The *κοινὸν Δοξιάς* designated the plays, the spectacles, the pænyrics, which were celebrated by turn in the different great cities of the province.

15. At Hierapolis, for example, we feel a true elegance, a city built spontaneously, and not officially; nothing of the socal administration too frequent in Roman cities.
16. Ovid, *Pont.* II. x. 21. To be seen especially by Aphrodisias and Hierapolis, still well preserved, and by the ruins of Laodicia, etc. Cf. Strabo, XIV. i. 37.
17. This has been shown by the cotton crises, and it will be still more obvious a hundred years hence.
18. Jos. B. J. II. xv. 4.
19. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 3154, 3192, 3304, 3408, 3485, 3495, 3496, 3497, 3498, 3499, 3504, 3639 (see *Add.*); 3858 e, 3924, 3938, 4340, g, 4346; See *Add.*; Le Bas, *Inscr.* III. 656, 755, 1571, 1687; Wagener, in the *Revûe de l'instr. publ. en Belgique*, 1868, 1. et seq.
20. Strabo, XII. iii. 29; viii. 16; XIV. i. 42. Cf. Waddington, *Mél. de Numism.* 2d series, p. 124, et seq.
21. Strabo, passage cited.
22. Compare, for example, the grand temple of Aphrodisias with the monuments of the Acropolis.
23. Strabo, XIII. viii. 16; *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2947, 2948, 3835, 3936, etc. These inscriptions enumerating the municipal functions, and the bestowing of the titles of *εὐεργέτης* and of *κτίστης* are innumerable. See, for example, Waddington, *Expl. des inscr.* of Le Bas, III. No. 1693 b.
24. Strabo, XII. viii. 16; XIII. iv. 8; XIV. i. 42. The beautiful ruins of Anatolia form a large part of this temple.
25. Tacitus, *Ann.* II. 47; Strabo, XII. viii. 18. Pliny, *Hist. nat.* II. 91.
26. Strabo. XII. viii. 16; XIII. iv. 14.
27. The *Tchoruk-Sou* of the Turks, Strabo, XII. viii. 16; Herod, vii. 30; Pliny v. 29; Hamilton, *Res. in Asia Minor*, I. p. 509, et seq.; Laborde, *Travels in Asia Minor*, p. 102, et seq., and plates. For the identification of the Caprus, see Waddington, *Expl. of the Inscript.* of Le Bas, III. No. 1693 a.
28. Col. i. 2; ii. 1; iv. 13, 15, 16; *Apoc.* i. 11; iii. 14.
29. Colossæ is the form used on the coins. Mionnet. IV. p. 267, 268; suppl. VII. p. 540, 541; Waddington. *Voy. num.* p. 20; Churchill Babington, *Numism. chronicle*, new series, III. p. et seq.
30. Laodicea (*Eski-Hissar*), and Hierapolis, *Tambouk* [and not *Pambouk*] *Kalessi* are to-day deserted. Denisli, more advantageously situated at the foot of the mountain, has replaced them. Perhaps the bottom of the valley having become unhealthful, the same thing happened here as at Ephesus, and Aïa-Solouk, Colossæ, of which the ruins are

seen at the confluence of three rivers (Tchoruk-Sou, Ak-Sou, Bou-narbaschi-Sou) in the plain, is also abandoned (see Hamilton, *Res. in Asia Minor*, I. 508, et seq.; Laborde, *Voy. de l'Asie Min.* p. 102, et seq.). Chonas, which is a league from it, and which has inherited a part of its importance, is the Byzantine city of *Χῶνας*, the name of which has nothing in common with that of Colossæ, although it coincides with the tunnels or gaps of the disappearance of the Lycus, near Colossæ. Cf. John Curopalate, *Hist.* p. 686, 687 (Bonn). Chonas may properly exist independently of Colossæ as a military position to defend a passage of the Cadmus.

31. Herodotus, vii. 30; Xenophon, *Anab.* I. ii. 6; Pliny, v. 41.
32. The ruins of Colossæ are those of a very secondary city. The theatre is mean. Probably the city was not greatly restored after the earthquake of the year 60. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 27; Eusebius, *Chronicle* ad ann. 10 Ner.; Orosius, vii. 7). The site of Chonæ must have been much pleasanter.
33. The Necropolis of Colossæ has a striking character, which makes it like the Necropolis of Semitic countries. The half columns are of strange forms, and without inscriptions. Many tombs are cut in the rocks.
34. Strabo, XII. viii. 16. The ruins of these cities are of the first order, truly grand and beautiful.
35. *Baba-Dagh* and *Chonas-Dagh*.
36. I will try some day to show this, dwelling on the names of mountains, of rivers, of cities, and on other particulars. For the religion of Laodicea, see Waddington, *Voy. numism.* p. 26, et seq. This Ζεὺς Ἀσείης, with his goat, is according to my idea the *Azazel* of the Semitic people.
37. Col. i. 6, 7; iv. 12, 13.
38. *Ibid.* ii. 1.
39. *Ibid.* i. 9; ii. 1. 13.
40. *Ibid.* iv. 13.
41. *Ibid.* iv. 15.
42. Philem. 1. 2. 5. 7.
43. *Ibid.* 2.
44. Comp. I. Cor. ix 5; Rom. xvi. 15. Saint John Chrysostom and Théodoret understand it so.
45. Col. iv. 17; Philem. 2.
46. Philem. 2.; cf. II. Tim. ii. 3.
47. Without that, we should not understand Philem. 1, 2.
48. Gal. vi. 6.
49. Jos. *Ant.* XII. iii. 4; XIV. x. 20; Acts ii. 10; Cic. *Pro Flacco*, 28; Wagener, in the *Revue de l'instr. publ. en Belg.* 1868, p. 3, 4. 14.

50. This is the date which the latest epigraphic discoveries assign to the letter of Pliny to Trajan on the Christians. Noël Desverges, in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1866, p. 83, 84; Mommsen, in the *Hermes*, III. 59, 96-98. Berlin. 1868.
51. Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97. Comp. I. Peter i. 1.
52. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 3857, g. p. 3865 *l* (cf. 2883 *d*); Le Bas, *Inscr.* iii. Nos. 727, 783, 785, and the notes of Waddington; Perrot, *Expl. de la Gal.* p. 126.
53. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 3872 *b, c*, 3890, 3902, 3902, *fn, r, r*, 3962 *b*, 3963, 3980; Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscr.* iii. Nos. 1654, 1703, 1899; cf. Mutori. *Inscr.* 1949, 3. I deem all these Christian inscriptions. Notice No. 3865 *i*, of *Corpus*, where we see equally an effort to evade the heathen formulæ. Compare as contrast, in Pisidia, the inscriptions, Nos. 4380 *r, s, t*.
54. Medals of Apamée Kibotos. Eckhel, III. 132, 139; Madden, in *Numismatic chronicle*, new series, vol. VI. p. 173, et seq. On an analogous, but doubtful peculiarity of the coins of the city of Mæonie, see De Witte, and Ch. Lenomant, in the *Melanges of archeol.* of fathers Martin and Chaier, vol. III. p. 172, et seq. 196, et seq. Incomium also adopted the fable of Enoch. See Stephen of Byz. at the word Ἰχόριον. Ch. Muller, *Frag. hist. gr.* III. 524; IV. 538, et seq. Cf. *Carm. sybill.* I. 261, et seq.; Hérodoteus, II. 2; Moses of Khoréne (?). *Géogr.* p. 349 (II. of *Mem.* of Saint Martin). The great marsh of Lycaonia had inspired diluvian myths. Ovide, *Met.* viii. et seq.
55. Trophimus, Tychicus, Tryphenus, Telesphorus, Papias, Onesimus, Abascantius, etc. These names are besides common to all of western Asia. *Corpus inscr. gr.* 2788, 3664, 3747 *n*, 3857 *c, k, r, t, u*, 3865 *i*, 3953 *h*, 4224 *c*, 4388 (cf. Garrucci, *Diss.* II. p. 183); *Expl. de la Gal.* p. 127, 128; Wagener, *Inscr. d'Asie Min.* p. 19; Le Bas, *Inscr.* III. 22, 341, 358, 364 (notwithstanding the correction), 667, 718, 737, 741, 779, 781, 784, 792, 804, 805, 807, 808, 815, 818, 819, 821, 822, 1104, 1671, 1690, 1774; Waddington, *Voy. num.* p. 55, 134. For the name of Grapte (*Pastor* of Herm. vis. ii. 4.) comp. *Corp. inscr. gr.* 3857 *q*; Le Bas. III. 782, 1567 (see, however, Jos. B. J. IV. ix. 11; Orelli 4610); Pape. Wœrt. s, h, v.
56. Notice, especially, Θεῶ ὑψίστῳ (Le Bas. III. No. 708. Wagener, p. 39, 40). Comp. *Miss. de Phen.* p. 234, et seq.
57. Perrot, *Explor. de la Gal.* p. 118.
58. *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 3330.
59. Θεῶ ὀσιῶ χαί διναίῳ. Le Bas. (Waddington) *Inscr.* iii. No. 1670.
60. *Inscr.* No. 3347 *n* of the *Corpus*, 1022 of Le Bas (iii). *inscr.*, No. 3857 *m* of the *Corpus*, 775 of Le Bas, p. 125 of Perrot; *Inscr.* No. 3857 *u* of the *Corpus*, No. 779 of Le Bas, *inscr.* No. 3827 *hh* of the *Corpus*, 805 of Le Bas, *Inscr.* No. 3827 *u* of the *Corp.* 816 of Le Bas,

61. Strabo, XII. viii. 18; XIII. iv. 11.
62. 1. Peter i. 1. Cf. Acts ii. 9, 10.
63. Apoc. ii. and iii.; Polycrates, in Eus. II. E. v. 24.
64. Polycrates, in Eusebius, l. c.
65. All of his writings.
66. Eusebius, II. E. iv. 26; v. 24. He had written on the Apocalypse.
67. Eusebius, II. E. iv. 26; v. 23, 25, *Chron. pascale*, p. 6, et seq. (Du Cange).
68. See
69. Denys of Cor. in Eus. II. E. ii. 25.
70. Comp. II. Cor. xi. 13.
71. See pp. 201, 202.
72. Apoc. ii. 2, 6.
73. Comp. II. Cor. xi. 22. Phil. iii. 5.
74. Apoc. ii. 9.
75. Comp. I. Cor. viii; Acts xv. 29. See note 75, Chap. X.
76. Apoc. ii. 14, 15.
77. Symbolical Designation of Paul, considered infidel, and encouraging infidelity.
78. Allusion to I. Cor. ii. 10. Paul often designated his revelations by the name of "Deep things of God." His enemies, for irony, substituted for the name of God the name of Satan.
79. Apoc. ii. 20, et seq.
80. Apoc. iii. 9.
81. Apoc. iii. 1, et seq.; 14, et seq.
82. Rom. xv. 20, et seq.; II. Cor. x. 13, 16.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. II. Cor. xi. 28.
2. Some critics, relying upon II. Cor. ii. 1; xii. 14, 21; xiii. 1, 2, suppose that Paul, during his sojourn at Ephesus, made a journey to Corinth, of which the Acts do not speak; but these passages explain themselves without any such hypothesis.
3. Acts xviii. 27, 28.
4. Acts xviii. 24, 28; I. Cor. iii., 5, et seq.
5. Acts xix. 1.
6. I. Cor. i. 10, et seq.; iii., et seq.; II. Cor. xii. 20. The church of Corinth kept the same defects a long time. See the first epistle of Clement Roman to the Corinthians, ch. 2, 3, 14, 46, 47, 54.

7. I. Cor. i. 17, et seq.
8. I. Cor. i. 12; iii. 4.
9. Resulting clearly from I. Cor. iii. 6, 8-10; iv. 6; xvi. 12.
10. I. Cor. iv. 6.
11. I. Cor. xvi. 12.
12. Tit. iii. 13.
13. II. Cor. v. 12; x. 12, et seq.; xi. 13, 16, et seq.; Rom. xv. 18, 20.
14. II. Cor. iii. 1; iv. 2; v. 12; x. 12, 18; xii. 11. Cf. *Recognit.* iv. 35,
Homil. pseudo-clem. xi. 35.
15. I. Cor. ix. 2; II., xii. 16. Cf. Jude ii. 16.
16. I. Cor. ix. 2, 3.
17. I. Cor. ix. 1, et seq.; II. Cor. xi. 7, et seq.
18. I. Cor. iv. 10, 12; ix. 4, et seq.; II. Cor. i. 12, et seq.; iii. 1; vi. 8;
x. 10-12; xi. 7.
19. Homil. pseudo-clem. xvii. 13-19.
20. II. Cor. v. 16.
21. I. Cor. i. 12; II. Cor. xi. 4, et seq.; xii. 11, et seq.
22. *Οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι.*
23. II. Cor. v. 16; x. 7.
24. *Recognitions*, iv. 36.
25. II. Cor. xi. 18.
26. I. Cor. viii. 1, et seq. Comp. *Recognitions*, iv. 36.
27. I. Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; . Cor. x. 7.
28. I. Cor. i. 22, 23; xv. 12, et seq. Cf. Acts xvii. 18, 32; xxiv. 26. The materialistic objections against the resurrection still remain among the heathens, and even in the consciences of Christians. See Athenagoras, *De resurr.*, 34; Minutius Felix, *Octav.*, ii. 34; See Arnobius ii. 13. Orig. *Contra Celsum* I. § 7; V. § 14, et seq.; letter of the churches of Vienna and of Lyon, in Eusebius H. E. v. 1, finally; Tatian, *Adv. Gr.* 6; Irenæus v. 3; Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, 15; Saint Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, xxii. 4, 12, et seq. For the inscriptions, see Leblant, in the *Review of Christian Art*, March, 1862, and *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, I. preface p. lxxxvi., et seq. The disappearance of the body left uneasiness. The popular legends arrange things generally, so that the bodies of martyrs are not entirely destroyed; fire leaves them unharmed, beasts do not devour them. The Pseudo-Phocylides (v. 99-108) forbids the dissecting of the corpses, and orders them to be buried with care, in view of the resurrection.
29. I. Cor. i. 17, et seq.; ii. 1, et seq. 13.
30. I. Cor. v. 9, et seq.; vi. 12, et seq.; x. 8.
31. Acts xv. 29.
32. I. Cor. v. 1, et seq.; vii.
33. I. Cor. iv. 6, 8; xi. 16-19; xiii. 4, et seq.; II. Cor. xii. 20.

34. I. Cor. xiv. 36.
35. I. Cor. xiv. 23, et seq.
36. I. Cor. xii. 15, et seq.; xiii. 4.
37. I. Cor. xiii. 5; xiv. 33, 39.
38. I. Cor. xiv. 40.
39. I. Cor. xi. 3, et seq.; xiv. 33-35.
40. See the grotesque etymology of *μεθυσεν*, in Philo. *De plantat. Nve*, § 39.
 1. I. Cor. xi. 20, et seq. Cf. Jude 12.
42. I. Cor. xi. 30.
43. Comp. I. Thess. iv., 13, et seq.
44. I. Cor. v. 5; xi. 30-32.
45. I. Cor. xvi. 15-17.
46. I. Cor. v. 9, et seq.
47. Navigation was not, in fact, resumed until about the 20th of March (Acts xxvii. 9; xxviii. 11; Vegetius, *De re milit.*, iv. 39). But the first epistle to the Corinthians was written before the Penetcost (I. Cor. xvi. 8), and probably even at the time of the Passover (I. Cor. v. 7, 8.)
48. I. Cor. i. 11.
49. Acts xix. 21.
50. Acts xix, 22; I. Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10, 11.
51. I. Cor. xvi. 11.
52. Comp. Rom. xvi. 23; II. Tim. iv. 20.
53. Acts xix. 22; I. Cor. xvi. 10.
54. I. Cor. xvi. 5.
55. I. Cor. xvi. 10.
56. I. Cor. xvi. 17, 18.
57. The Latin version has inserted these last two names in the 15th verse at random.
58. I. Cor. vii. 1; viii. 1; xii. 1; xvi. 1.
59. I. Cor. xvi. 17, 18.
60. I. Cor. xvi. 8.
61. I. Cor. iv. 19; xi. 34; xvi. 3, et seq., 11.
62. I. Cor. xvi. 5.
63. I. Cor. i. 1. Comp. xvi. 21.
64. Is. xxix. 14.
65. Comp. Matt. xvi. 1, et seq.
66. That is to say, the spiritual phenomena and the miracles.
67. Job v. 13.
68. Psalms xciv. 11.
69. That is to say, in such or such a master, Paul, Apollos, &c.

70. Analogous proverb to our "plus royaliste que le roi." Paul alludes to those who were more enthusiastic for Paul and Apollos, than Paul and Apollos themselves.
71. Without the help of Paul and Apollos.
72. I. Cor. v. 1, et seq.
73. Cf. I. Tim. i. 20. See *The Apostles*, p. 87, et seq.
74. Acts v. 1-11. Comp. Acts xiii. 9. 11.
75. I. Cor. v. 9, et seq.
76. I. Cor. v. 10, 11; vi. 9, 10.
77. *Ibid.* Schleusner, on the words *πλεονεκτής, πλενεξά*.
78. Jos. Ant. XIV. x. 17; Code, lib. I. tit. ix. *De Judæis et caliculis*, law 8. Cf. *Epist. Clem. ad jac.*, § 10, at the head of pseudo-Clem. Homilies.
79. I. Cor. vi. 12, et seq.
80. I. Cor. vii. 1, et seq.
81. I. Cor. vii. 39.
82. I. Cor. vii. 26.
83. Matt. xxix. 19; Mark xiii. 17; Luke xxi. 23; cry of Jesus, son of Hanan, in Jos. B. J., VI. v. 3.
84. Of twenty-six persons mentioned, Rom. xvi. 3-16 names not more than three couples married.
85. I. Cor. vii. 36.
86. I. Cor. vii. 9.
87. I. Cor. vii. 37, 38.
88. I. Cor. vii. 29-35.
89. Talm. of Bab. *Jebamoth*, 63 b., et seq.
90. *Ibid.*
91. Eph. v. 22, 23. We may doubt this epistle's being the work of Paul.
92. Gen. ii.
93. I. Cor. viii. 1, et seq.
94. Acts xv. 20; *Apoc.* ii. 14, 15, 20; Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 35; Pseudo-Clem. *Recognit.* iv. 36; Pliny, *Epist.*, x. 97 (*passim venire victimas*).
95. I. Cor. vi. 2; x. 22-24, 33.
96. I. Cor. viii. 10; x. 14, et seq. Comp. II. Cor. vi. 14, et seq. Cf. Homil. pseudo-clem. vii. 4, 8.
97. I. Cor. x. 27, et seq.
98. I. Cor. x. 31-33.
99. Allusion to the attacks of the Judo-Christians.
100. Comp. I. Cor. x. 33.
101. The Isthmian games, well known among the Corinthians.
102. Comp. Horace *Art poet.* v. 412.
103. I. Cor. ix. 1, et seq.
104. I. Cor. xiv. 33-35.
105. Comp. Eph. v. 22, et seq.

106. I. Cor. xi. 3, et seq. Cf. Sifré on *Nombr.* v. 18.
107. Cf. Tertullian, *Contra Marcion*, v. 8. *De virginibus velandis.*
108. See Psalm cxxxviii. 1; Buxtorf, *Synogoga* c. x. p. 222; c. xv. p. 306 (Ball. 1661).
109. Gen. vi. 2, and the Targum of Jonathan on this passage. *Testam. of the twelve patriarchs*, Reuben 5. According to Jewish ideas, the voice and the hair of women are nudities. Talm. of Bab. *Berakoth* 24 a.
110. Tobias xii. 12, 15; Apoc. viii. 3, et seq.; Enoch, in the Syncele, p. 43 (Bonn); *Evang. de la nat. de sainte Marie*, c. 4; Porphyry, *De abstin.*, ii. 38. The Christian authorities, Tertullian, Origen, Saint Ephraim, Saint Augustin, are omitted.
111. Comp. Col. iii. 18; Eph. v. 22, 23.
112. I. Cor. xi. 20, et seq.
113. Compare, for example, I. Cor. x. 17; xii. 27.
114. I. Cor. x. 16-18.
115. I. Cor. xi. 23-29. I have followed the shortest and most authentic text of the *Codex Vaticanus* and of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, banishing the little additions of the received text, which, besides, only explain the sense.
116. Comp. I. Cor. v. 5.
117. Comp. Ep. of Jude, 12.
118. I. Cor. xii-xiv. Comp. Rom. xii. 3-8; Eph. iv. 7, et seq.; I. Peter iv. 10, 11. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 39.
119. *Χαρίσματα.*
120. *Διακονίαι.*
121. *Ενεργήματα.*
122. I. Cor. xii. 28. Paul does not name here the *πρεσβύτεροι*, nor the *ἐπίσκοποι*. It seems, besides, that for Paul these three degrees of the hierarchy are *ενεργήματα*; comp. I. Cor. xii. 6 to Gal. ii. 8. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 11), the evangelists and the pastors *ποιμένες* identical, doubtless, with the *ἐπίσκοποι*, rank among the prophets and doctors. Thus the functions in this epistle are five in number.
123. I. Cor. xii. 4., et seq., 28-30; xiv. 5, 6, 26.
124. *Λόγος σοφίας.*
125. *Λόγος γνώσεως.*
126. *Πίστις.*
127. *Χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων.*
128. *Ενεργήματα δυνάμεων*, or *δυνάμεις.*
129. *Διακρίσεις πνευμάτων.*
130. *Γένη γλωσσῶν.*
131. *Διερμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν.*
132. *Ἀντιλήψεις.*

133. *Κυβερνήσεις*. These last two functions were evidently deaconships. the other eight exercises may be considered as *χαρίσματα*, with the exception of the fifth, which is a *ἐνρίθνημα*. The "revelation" (*ἀποκάλυψις*), xiv. 6, 26, is not a permanent gift, but a passing favor made to a believer.
134. *Οὐδέποτε ἐχπιπτει*.
135. II. Cor. iii. 6.
136. I. Cor. xiv. entire.
137. *Γλωσσά* for the classics means always a strange or foreign word, a word which needs interpretation. The "Glossaries" are collections of words to explain.
138. I. Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22.
139. I. Cor. i. 7, 8; iii. 13; iv. 5; vi. 23; vii. 26, 29, et seq.; xi. 26; xv. entire; xvi. 22. Cf. Tim. iv. 1.
140. I. Cor. xv. 3, et seq.
141. I follow the reading of manuscript B, of the Vatican, which is also that of the received text. Comp. I. Thess. iv. 12, et seq.
142. Is. xxv. 8., punctuated differently from the Masore, and badly translated.
143. Hosea xiii. 14 read like the Septuagint, differently from the Masore, and badly translated.
144. I. Thess. iv. 16, I. Cor. xv. 51, 52.
145. I. Cor. xv. 30-32.
146. Compare Phil. iv. 5.
147. I. Cor. xvi. 22.

CHAPTER XV.

1. I. Cor. xvi. 10, 11.
2. I. Cor. xvi. 12.
3. Titus iii. 13. This epistle is apocryphal, and shows only the opinion which was formed on the surroundings of Paul at the time it was written.
4. Those who maintain the authenticity of the epistles to Timothy and Titus, place here a voyage of Paul not mentioned in the Acts, and of which the itinerary would have been Ephesus, Crete, Corinth, Neapolis of Epirus, Macedonia, Ephesus. We have shown in the introduction the reasons which prevent our admitting this hypothesis.
5. II. Cor. x. 16; Rom. xv. 24-28.
6. Rom. x. 23.

7. Acts xix. 21; xxiii. 11; Rom. i. 10, et seq.; xv. 22 et seq.
8. Gal. ii. 10.
9. Rom. xv. 26.
10. Jos. *Ant.* XX. ix. 7.
11. Acts xi. 29, 30; II. Cor. ix. 12.
12. Rom. xv. 27.
13. Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 28; Jos. *Ant.* XIV. x. 6, 8; XVI. vi. entire; XVIII. iii. 5; Philo. *Leg. ad Caium*, § 23; Tacitus, *Hist.* V. 5.
This custom tends to become re-established in our day among the Jews.
14. II. Cor. ix. 12-14; Rom. xv. 31.
15. II. Cor. viii. 10; ix. 2.
16. In the lost letter. That which he says I. Cor. xvi. 1-4, supposes that there had long been question of it.
17. I. Cor. xvi. 1.
18. I. Cor. xvi. 1-4.
19. II. Cor. viii. 19.
20. I. Cor. xvi. 11; II. Cor. i. 1. It is possible, however, that Timothy did not go as far as Ephesus, and tarried in Macedonia, where Paul found him again.
21. II. Cor. vii. 6, et seq.
22. II. Cor. i. 15, 16.
23. II. Cor. ii. 13; vii. 6, et seq.; xii. 18.
24. II. Cor. viii. 6.
25. I. Cor. xvi. 10, 11.
26. II. Cor. vii. 14.
27. II. Cor. xii. 18; Comp. viii. 18-22.
28. II. Cor. i. 4, et seq.; iv. 8, et seq.
29. II. Cor. i. 8.
30. Acts xx. 19; xxi. 27.
31. Acts xix. 23, et seq.
32. I. Cor. xvi. 9.
33. II. Cor. i. 8-10; vi. 9.
34. Acts xix. 23, et seq.
35. Strabo XIV. i. 26.
36. Among the numerous inscriptions of Ephesus, there are few that do not speak of the temple. *Corpus inscr. gr.* Nos. 2953 *b*, et seq.; Le Bas and Waddington, *inscr.*; III. No. 136, *a*, et seq. Remark, especially, the frequent return of the title of *νεωποτός*. See Acts xix. 35, comparing *Corp.*, No. 2972, and Eckhel, *D. n. v.* II. p. 52, et seq. Notice also the *ιερεῖαι τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος*. *Corp.* Nos. 2986, 3001, 3002, etc. Cf. Herodotus, I. 26; Elien, *Hist. var.* III. 26.

37. See Dion Cassius XXXIX. 20. Comp. *Εἰς τὴν Ἀριόστον Πητορίχ. ὑπόμν. ανων.*, published by Conrad Neobarius, Paris, 1539, folio 26, verse, — lines 28, 29. For the figured monuments, see the Abbé Greppo, *Recherches sur les temples portatifs des anciens*, (Lyons, 1834.) p. 22, et seq.
38. The theatre of Ephesus is of Roman construction, but it may have been built before Nero. Besides it has been retouched several times. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 2976; Texier, *Asie Min.* p. 315.
39. Falkener, *Ephesus*, p. 102, et seq.
40. Falkener, *op. cit.* Hypothetic plans of Ephesus.
41. There were several asiarchs at a time. See the passages of Strabo and Ælius Aristides, cited above. When a person had once been an asiarch he kept the title. See the inscriptions cited above, note 13, Chap. XIII.; and Perrot, *De Gal. prov. Rom.* p. 156, et seq.
42. The rôle of this Alexander remains in the Acts altogether undecided.
43. *Γραμματεὺς*, important charge in the cities of Asia. Vaillant, *Num. gr. imp. rom.* p. 313, 114.
44. The province of Asia being senatorial, had no Roman legion. The police was chiefly in the hands of the natives.
45. II. Cor. i. 15, 16.
46. II. Cor. i. 17-23; ii. 1, 2.
47. II. Cor. vii. 6, et seq.
48. II. Cor. x. 1, 2, 10, 11.
49. II. Cor. ii. 3.
50. I. Cor. xvi. 5, et seq.
51. Acts xx. 1.
52. Acts xx. 4; II. Cor. viii. 19.
53. I. Cor. xvi. 8.
54. Acts xx. 31.
55. Rom. xvi. 17-20. It must be remembered that Rom. xvi. 3-20, is a fragment of an Epistle to the Ephesians.
56. Apoc. II. i. et seq.
57. I. Cor. xvi. 19; Rom. xvi. 3-5; II. Tim. iv. 19.
58. Rom. xvi. 5. The reading *Ἀχαΐας* is certainly bad. Compare *ibid.* 12.
59. Rom. xvi. 6. *Γμαῖς* seems the good reading. Compare *ibid.*, 12.
60. Rom. xvi. 9.
61. Rom. xvi. 10.
62. *Ibid.* 13.
63. Compare Le Bas, *Inscr.* III. 804 (cf. Perrot *Expl.* p. 120) and 1104.
64. Rom. xvi. 12.
65. *Ibid.* 8.
66. *Ibid.* 11. Paul calls it *συγγενής*. See *The Apostles*, p. 108 to 168.
67. Rom. xvi. 14.

68. Compare I. Cor. ix. 5; and also Philem. 2.
69. Rom. xvi. 15.
70. Rom. xvi. 10.
71. Ibid. 11. Paul not saluting these two persons, we must conclude that they were not Christians. Note the difference of verses 5-14, 15.
72. Acts xx. 4; Col.¹ iv. 7, et seq.; Ephes; vi. 21; II. Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12. About this name, see *Corpus inscr. gr.* No. 3855 i.
73. Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29; II. Tim iv. 20.
74. See *The Apostles*, p. 108.
75. Rom. xvi. 7.
76. Tit. iii. 12. His name (Artemidorus) his association to Tychicus and the rôle he plays in the epistle to Titus, causes us to believe him an Ephesian.
77. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 3664, line 17.
78. This name seems to belong to the city of Phygelus, near Ephesus. See an inscription of Scala-Nova. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 3027.
79. I. Tim. i. 20; II. Tim. i. 15; ii. 17; iv. 14, 15. The destination of these two letters (apocryphal) appears to be Ephesus.
80. Cf. *corp. inscr. gr.* No. 3664, line 52; 4213; Mionnet, II. 546.
81. II. Tim. i. 16-18; iv. 19.
82. For example, *Tryphosa*.
83. I. Cor. vii. 21-22.
84. *Inscr.* of Lanuvium, 2d col. line 3, et seq.
85. *Inscr.* No. 77 of Pittakis in the *Εφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική* of Athens, 1838, p. 121.
86. Arrian, *Epict. Dissert.* III. 26; Dio Chrysostom orat. XIV. p. 269, et seq. (Emperius); Cf. p. 167, and in our fourth volume, concerning the *I^a Petri*.
87. The exquisite politeness of Paul's letters is proof of it.
88. Gaiety is a prevailing characteristic of Paul's Christians. II. Cor. vi. 10; xiii. 11; Rom. xii. 8-12-15; xiv. 17; Phil. ii. 17, 18.
89. Tertullian Apol. 39.
90. Remark for example, the smiling figures of the Catacombs, for example, the *fossor* Diogenes (Boldetti, p. 60.)

CHAPTER XVI.

1. Compare Acts xx. 13.
2. II. Cor. ii. 13.
3. Acts xvi. 9, et seq.
4. II. Cor. ii. 12.

5. The Latin inscriptions of this city prove it. See Le Bas and Waddington. Inscr. III. Nos. 1731, et seq.
6. II. Tim. iv. 13. Cf. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 3664, line 17; *Ann. de l'Inst. archéol.*, 1868, p. 93.
7. Acts xx. 6, et seq.
8. I. Cor. ii. 13, et seq.
9. Acts xx. 1, 2.
10. Compare I. Cor. xvi. 8, and xx. 2, 3, 6-16.
11. Phil. ii. 12; iii. 18.
12. Acts xx. 4.
13. II. Cor. i. 4, et seq.; vii. 4, 5.
14. *Ibid.* viii. 1, et seq.
15. Phil. iii. 18, 19.
16. II. Cor. vii. 6, et seq.
17. See p. 234.
18. II. Cor. vii. 7, 11, 15.
19. *Ibid.* vii. 13, 15.
20. *Ibid.* viii. 6, et seq.
21. II. Cor. ii. 6.
22. *Ibid.* xii. 18.
23. *Ibid.* vii. 8, et seq.
24. II. Cor. i. 12, et seq. 23; ii. 1, et seq. 9; iii. 1, et seq.; vii. 2, et seq. 12, et seq.; x. 9, et seq.; xi. 1, et seq.
25. II. Cor. i. 1. Compare I. Cor. i. 1. The person that Paul joins in the superscription is usually the one who serves as Secretary. If this had been simply a mark of respect, he would have used this time the name of Titus.
26. II. Cor. i. 4, et seq.; vii. 4, et seq.
27. II. Cor. i. 15, et seq.
28. II. Cor. ii. 2.
29. *Ibid.* vii. 8, et seq.
30. *Ibid.* ii. 5-11; vii. 11, 12.
31. II. Cor. vii. 14.
32. *Καπηλεύοντες*.
33. II. Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2.
34. *Ibid.* iii. 1; v. 12; x. 12, 18; xii. 11.
35. *Ibid.* xi. 13, et seq.
36. *Ibid.* v. 16. Paul seemed here to allude to a period of his life when he preached Jesus after the manner of the apostles of the circumcision; which they sometimes recall to make him contradict himself.
37. II. Cor. x. compare iii. 1-6.
38. Ephes. iii. 8.
39. I. Cor. xv. 9, 10; compare II. Cor. iii. 5.

40. *Οἱ υπερλίαν ἀποστολοὶ*; an emphatic expression of which hierosolymite emissaries probably made use, and that Paul retakes in irony. This expression has been supposed to apply to the adversaries of Paul at Corinth; those whom he calls the lowest *Ψευδαποστολοὶ*. But it seems impossible that throughout this passage Paul compares himself to people so inferior as these detractors of Corinth. Compare I. Cor. xv. 10; and II. Cor. x. 13, et seq. In truth the *Ψευδαποστολοὶ* of Corinth being the praisers of Peter, and the apostles of Jerusalem. Paul confounds them, to a certain point, in his reply.
41. II. Cor. xi. 5-12.
42. II. Cor. xi. 1, et seq. The literal translation of this piece would be unintelligible. We have sought to render the exact idea and the spirit.
43. See "*The Apostles*," p. 238.
44. Compare I. Cor. xvi. 5, et seq. II. Cor. i. 15, et seq. It would certainly be more natural to suppose that Paul wished to say that he had been twice to Corinth. II. Cor. (II. Cor. ii. 1; xii. 14, 21; xiii. 1). But, besides that Acts only speaks of two sojourns of the apostle at Corinth, all the series of facts supposed by the two epistles to the Corinthians, exclude the hypothesis of an intermediate sojourn between the two certain sojourns. See II. Cor. xii. 21; xiii. 2.
45. II. Cor. xi. xii. and xiii. Cf. ii. 3.
46. II. Cor. viii. 1-5.
47. II. Cor. viii. 21; Rom. xii. 17.
48. Rom. xv. 28.
49. II. Cor. viii. 19-21, 23; Acts xx. 4; I. Cor. xvi. 3, 4; Phil. ii. 25.
50. II. Cor. viii. ix.
51. Exodus xvi. 18.
52. II. Cor. viii. 6, 16, 17.
53. II. Cor. viii. 18-22; compare *ibid.* xii. 18. There is no sufficient reason to believe that in either of these passages reference is made to a real brother of Paul or of Titus.
54. II. Cor. viii. 4; prevents from thinking of the Macedonians of Acts xx. 4. Luke would be the person best suited; but then the brevity of Acts xx. 1-3; compared to the prolixity which predominates on the part of Acts xx. 4, et seq., are not explained. Luke does not rejoin Paul until the last passage to Philippi.
55. II. Cor. viii. 24.
56. Compare Eccles. xxv. 11.
57. II. Cor. viii. 6, 16, 18, 22, 23; ix. 5.
58. II. Cor. 1, 4, 6; viii. 2; xii. 12; Rom. v. 3; viii. 17, 18, 35-37; xii. 12.
59. II. Cor. vi. 4-10.
60. Cor. xiii. 11.

CHAPTER XVII.

1. II. Cor. ix. 4; Acts xx. 4. Comp. Rom. xvi. 21, 22 (*Σώπατρος Σωβιπατρος*); II. Cor. viii. 19, 23; I. Cor. xvi. 3, 4; Acts xx. 2, 3, implies that the Macedonians went to Corinth with Paul, and that the latter did not take them upon his second passage into Macedonia. Rom. xvi. 21, 22, proves the same thing.
2. Rom. xvi. 21.
3. Acts xx. 4. They are not named in Romans xvi.
4. Rom. xvi. 21; Acts xx. 4.
5. I. Cor. xvi. 6, 7; II. Cor. i. 16; Acts xx. 3.
6. Rom. xvi. 23 (Greek text); I. Cor. i. 14.
7. II. Cor. vi. 14; vii. 1, a passage out of place.
8. An inference from the whole of Epistle to the Romans.
9. Rom. xv. 18, 20.
10. Rom. xv. 26.
11. The expression *εκυληθῆναι πᾶσαι* (Rom. xvi. 16) supposes that the apostle had just left the churches of Macedonia.
12. In fact, the epistle has four endings, xv. 33; xvi. 20; xvi. 24; xvi. 27. The portion, xvi. 3, 20, or at least xvi. 3, 16, is certainly addressed to the church of Ephesus. The ending xvi. 25, 27, is placed in excellent texts, at end of Chap. xiv. In the *Codex Alexandrinus* it occurs twice, at end of Chap. xiv., and end of Chap. xvi. Without doubt, one of the circular epistles ended with Chap. xiv. In fact, Chap. xv. is composed of two parts. 1st, The verses 1-14, which only repeat Chap. xiv. and which surely did not occur in the letters which contained Chap. xiv. 2d, The verses, 14-33, which are peculiar to Romans. The comparison of the epistles to Colossians and to Ephesians furnishes an example of such circular letters, differing from each other by considerable variation. The apostle liked to make the same epistle serve several churches. Col. iv. 16. The passage II. Cor. vi. 14; vii. 1, seems like a fragment which the editors did not wish to let perish, and which may have been intercalated into an epistle, the arrangement of which it disturbs.
13. Rom. xvi. 3-16. See Introduction, p. 41, et seq.
14. The copy which had xvi. 21-24, for an ending, speaks of Jason and Sosipater in it, prominently and as persons known.
15. The eleven first chapters are dogmatic, excepting a few changes in Chap. i.
16. The verses, xv. i, 13, which are like a concession to the Jewish-Christians, appear to have been destined to sum up and replace Chaps. xii. xiii. and xiv. in the copy for the church of Rome. See Introduction, p. 40, et seq.

17. See Intro. p. 44, et seq.
18. Rom. i. 2-4; 14-17; ii. 9-11. Comp. Eph. ii. and iii.
19. Rom. i. 18; iii. 20.
20. Comp. Acts xxvi. 18.
21. Gen. xv. 6. The Hebrew passage is slightly bent from its meaning.
22. Rom. iii. 21; iv. 25.
23. Rom. v. 1-11.
24. Comp. I. Cor. xv. 44-50. This theory of an Adam type (*Adam Kadmon*) has been much developed by the Cabbalists. In the Talmud writings, *Adam ha-rischôn* simply means "the first man," Adam. Paul creates *Ha-adam-ha aharôn* by antithesis.
25. Rom. iv. 12, 21-26.
26. Comp. Rom. iii. 5-8.
27. Comp. I. Cor. xv. 56.
28. Rom. vi. vii. The true reading of vii. 25, appears to be *χαρις τῷ θεῷ*.
29. Allusion to two Hebrew words, pronounced by glossologists.
30. Allusion to the sighs of the glossologists.
31. Rom. viii. 1-27.
32. Rom. viii. 28, 29.
33. Rom. xiv. 15; I. Cor. ix. 22; Phil. iii. 15, et seq.
34. Ex. ix. 16.
35. Rom. ix. 1-29.
36. Rom. ix. 30-33, and x. entire.
37. II. Cor. iii. 13-16.
38. Rom. xi.
39. *Δογικὴ λατρεία*. Comp. I. Petri, ii. 2, 5. *Testam. des douze patr. Lévi 3.*
40. Ideas analogous to Philo. (*De plantat. Noe*, § 25, 18-31; *De vict. offr.* § 1-10) and with the Essenes (Jos. Ant. XVIII. i. 5; Philo. *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12). Comp. Theophrastes, *Περὶ εὐσεβείας* (Bernay's Berlin, 1866.)
41. Comp. above, p. 243, 244.
42. Prov. xxv. 21; Deut. xxxii. 35; Eccl. xxviii. 1.
43. Rom. xii; xiii. 8-10.
44. Epiph. hæc. xxx. 16; Hom. pseudo-clem. xv. 6, 7, 8.
45. *Δειτουργοὶ θεοῦ*. It must be remembered that for the Jew the tribute implied a religious idea. Comp. Melito. in Cureton. *Spicil.* syr. p. 43.
46. Rom. xiii. 1-7.
47. Tacitus *Ann.* xiii. 50, 51; Suetonius, *Nero*, 10.
48. Suetonius Claud. 25.

49. I. Petri iv. 14-16.
50. Rom. xii. 17. Cf. I. Thess. iv. 11.
51. Rom. xiii. 11-14.
52. Comp. Gal. 4. 10; Col. ii. 16.
53. Epiph. hæc. xxx. 18.
54. Epiph. hæc. xxx. 2, 15, 16, 17, 18; Hom. pseudo-clem. viii. 15; xii. 6; xiv. 1; xv. 7. Comp. Ebionite accounts concerning style of life of James brother of the Lord (Eus. H. E. ii. 23, and the life of St. Matthew; Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* II. i.)
55. Dan. i. 8, 12; Jos. *Vita*, 2, 3.
56. See, above, p. 238, et seq.
57. Rom. xiv. and xv. 1-13, by observing that these two pages repeat each other, and do not constitute part of the same copy of the epistle. See Intro. p. 39, 40.
58. Rom. xvi. 21-24. See Intro. p. 43. Comp. the ἀσπαύμοι, like κατ' ὄνομα in a papyrus of the Louvre. *Notices et extraits*, vol. XVIII. 2d part. p. 422.
59. Rom. xvi. 1, 2. See Intro. p. 41, 43, and 44. These two verses are much more in connection with what follows than with what precedes. Although nothing was superior to the devotion of Phebe, we can understand better that she should have made a winter voyage of eighty leagues than three hundred leagues. Let us add, that it was more natural for Paul to have recommended Phebe to the Ephesians, whom he knew, than to the Romans whom he did not know.
60. Rom. xvi. 17-20.
61. Rom. i. 8.
62. Inference of Acts xxviii. 17, et seq.
63. Epiph. hæc. xxx. 18. It was at Rome that the Ebionite tradition was strongest. The Hom. pseudo-clem. Ebionite work was written in Rome.
64. *Comment. in XIII. Epist. Pauli* (of Hilary), in works of St. Ambrose, edit. of Bened. Vol. II. 2d part, col. 25 and 30.
65. The passages of Epistle to Romans, inferring that the church of Rome was composed mostly of heathen and proselytes, Rom. i. 6, 11. 13; vi. 14, 17. et seq.; iii. 1-6; xi. 13, 25, 28, 30; xiv. 1, et seq. xv. 7, et seq. arise from the fact that the Romans were not the sole intended recipients of the said epistle. These formulas, are, moreover, so vague that good critics have been able to conclude therefrom, some, that the epistle to Romans was written to converted heathen, others, that it was written to Jewish-Christians.
66. II. Cor. 15-16; Rom. xv. 20-21.
67. Rom. xv. 14. 15.
68. See Intro. p. 40, et seq.

69. Rom. i. 1, 5, 11, 13, 14; xi. 13; xv. 14-16, 18.
70. Rom. i. 10, et seq; xv. 22, et seq. (Cf. Acts xix. 21), show that the apostle supposed the church of Rome in full conformity of principles with him.
71. Rom. i. 10, et seq.; xv. 22, et seq.; Acts xix. 21.
72. Rom. i. 5-7, 9, et seq.; xi. 13; xv. 14-16.
73. Rom. i. 10, et seq. xv. 29, 32, parts belonging to copy addressed to Romans.
74. Those who hold that Titus iii. 12, corresponds to any historical reality can imagine that Paul, during these three winter months, made the journey to Nicopolis of Epirus, and find superficial support in II. Cor. x. 14, 16; Rom. xv. 19; II. Tim. iv. 10. But this removes none of the difficulties which oppose the admission of the Epistle to Titus.
75. Phil. ii. 13.
76. Acts xvi. 31.
77. The Talmud is the expression of these endless scruples.
78. See *Life of Jesus*, and p. 275, preceding; and in vol. iv. when Epistle to Colossians shall be under consideration. Comp. Pseudo-Hierac. vii. letter, lines 87-89 (Bernays).
79. Elizabeth Wetherell. Comp. Matt. xi. 28.
80. See Jewish expression of same sentiment in IV. Book of Esdras iii. 21, 22; iv. 30; vii. 46. et seq.; viii. 35, et seq.
81. Acts xiii. 38-39.
82. Zosimus ii. 29; Sozomen i. 5.
83. This is, above all, perceptible in the writings of Luke. We see in them a fixed determination to show the conversion of the heart, taking place outside of legal and moral works. In this respect, Luke is the true disciple of Paul.
84. Acts xiii. 39.
85. Rom. xv. 25.
86. Acts xx. 22, 23.
87. Ps. xlv. (Vulg. xliii.) 23.
88. Rom. viii. 35-37.
89. Rom. xv. 20, 21.
90. Rom. xv. 30, 31.
91. Acts xx. 22.
92. Rom. xv. 25, 26, 31.
93. Acts xx. 4. Comp. I. Cor. xvi. 3, 4; II. Cor. vii. 19, 23; ix. 4; Rom, xvi. 21. It is true that in the passage of Acts just quoted we read in most MSS. *Συνειποντο δε αὐτῷ ἄχρι τῆς Ἀβιάς*. But if one compares all the passages just brought forward, one will be convinced that the persons named, Acts xx. 4, were mostly deputies of the churches, and at least they set out from Corinth with the

intention of going to Jerusalem. If this was a simple escort of respect, only destined to accompany the apostle to Miletus, how can we explain the fact of the escort being composed of Macedonians, Ephesians, and Lycaonians, and not a single Corinthian? Their mission would have been strangely performed, since they were separated from the apostle during the greater part of the journey. Finally, in the opinion of all, Trophimus accompanied the apostle to Jerusalem. The MS. B. of the Vatican, the *Sinaiticus*, and the Vulgate have not ἄχρι τῆς Αἰδαῖς.

- 94 Acts xx. 3.
95. Acts xx. 6.
96. Rom. xv. 19, 23. The frontiers of Illyria and Macedonia were considered as separating the Orient and Occident. The passage quoted in no wise exacts that Paul did land in Illyria. Comp. II. Cor. x. 14-16. *Ιλλυρικον* does not only designate the province of Illyria (or rather Dalmatia), properly speaking. *Illyricum*, in the common sense of the word, embraced, beside, many countries to the north and east, which did not constitute part of the province of Illyria (see Desjardins in *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 1868, p. 112 et seq. *Ann. de l'Inst. arch. de Rome*, 1868, p. 7, et seq.), portions of the province of Macedonia (Strabo, II. v. 30; vii. v. 6; vii. 8. vii. frag. II. p. 275, line 21, et seq.; ed. Didot. comp. VII. vii. 4). When Paul was at Berea, he had been μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ.
97. Rom. xv. 20, 21. See above p. 264, 265.
98. Rom. xv. 23.
99. Rom. xvi. 25, 26; II. Tim. iv. 17. Cf. Acts i. 8; xiii. 47; Rom. x. 18; Isa. xlix. 6, Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* I. Chap. 5.
100. Rom. i. 10, et seq.; xii. 24, 28, 29, 32; Acts xix. 21:
101. Rom. xv. 14. 28.
102. The contrary assertion is a mere supposition, or only rests upon apocryphal documents. See Jost. *Geschichte de Israeliten*, v. 12, et seq. Amador de los Riòs, *Estudios sobre los Judios de España* (Madrid, 1848). c. 1.
103. Clem. Rom.; *Epist. ad Cor.* i. 5. II. Cor. x. 13-16; Rom, xv. 19, 23, 24, xvi. 26; II. Tim. iv. 17. Cf. *Epist. Clem. ad Jac.* (at the head of the Homilies), § 1.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. Acts xx. 3, 4; xxiv. 17.
2. An inference from the entire recital. See above all, Acts xx. 16, 13, 16, 17, 18, 36.

3. Comp. *Mischna, Erubin*, iv. 2.
4. Comp. *Phil.* ii. 12, iii. 18.
5. Acts xx. 5, 6. See above, p. 106, et seq. The vividness and correctness of Acts xx. 6, et seq., compared to the dryness of what precedes, are surely by a man who, in his narration, passes from things which he has not seen, and which he does not well know, to things which he has witnessed.
6. For all this one needs only to follow, step by step, the narration of the Acts xx. 6, et seq., a narration the form of which guarantees exactitude.
7. Acts xx. 23.
8. II. Kings iv. 34.
9. Now in ruins, village of Beiram keui.
10. Now Kastro of Metelin.
11. Doubtless at the Capital of the isle, now Port Tigani, near the village of Cora.
12. Strabo, XIV. i. 12, 13, 14; Pliny. v. 31; Ptol. V. ii. 8. See maps of Eng. Admr., Nos. 1530 and 1555.
13. Strabo XIV. i. 6. The deposits of the Meander have located Miletus (now Palatia) inland, (Map of the Admiralty, No. 1555).
14. The author of the Acts was present at this discourse, but it is clear that we must not look for a literal reproduction here. The narrator doubtless modified the discourse according to the state of mind in which he was when writing it. The prediction of verse 25 does not well accord with *Phil.* ii. 24, and *Philemon*, 22.
15. From dreams and presentiments, or from fortuitous signs considered prophetic, or from the prophets. Comp. Acts xxi. 4, 10, et seq.
16. Here the author of Acts forces the tone, and offers us ideas not of 58, the year in which we are, but of the years 75 or 80.
17. The capitals of the isles of Coos and Rhodes have remained in the same spot as in antiquity.
18. Now in ruins.
19. Acts xi. 19.
20. Acts xv. 3.
21. Saint Jean d'Acre.
22. See *Apostles*.
23. Eph. iv. 11; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 37.
24. Acts xxi. 11, to be compared with II. Kings xxii. 11.

CHAPTER XIX.

1. Acts xx. 16. By adding the days enumerated in Acts, by allowing only five days for the sail from Patara to Tyre, four days for repose at Cesarea,

by reckoning all the rest at the shortest, we obtain just fifty days from the Passover celebrated at Philippi. But four days are too little to correspond to *ἡμερὰς πλείους*, passed at Cesarea. Besides, the turn of verse xxi. 16, would not have been so doubting, if Paul had arrived at the period which he had agreed upon. Finally, Acts xxi. 17, et seq., do not lead us to think that Paul passed the feast at Jerusalem.

2. Acts xxi. 21.
3. Apoc. ii. 14, 20; Hom. pseudo-clem. vii. 4, 8.
4. Comp. xv. 20; I. Cor. viii. 1, et seq. II. Cor. vi. 16, et seq.; Jude 7, 11; II. Petri ii. 15; Apoc. ii. 14, 15, 20; Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 35; Pseudo-Clem. *Recognit.* iv. 36.
5. James ii. 21-24. Comp. Rom. iii. 27, 28; ix. 2-5.
6. Acts xv. 21; xxi. 20.
7. Acts xxi. 17. et seq.
8. Acts i. 13; iii. 1, 3, 4, 11; iv. 13, 19; viii. 14.
9. Acts xxi. 20.
10. James ii. 5, et seq.
11. James i. 10, 11; ii. et seq.; iv. 1, et seq.; v. i, et seq.; 9.
12. Remember the expression of Saint Jerome, *Omnis dives aut iniquus est aut hæres iniqui.*
13. James ii. 1, et seq.
14. James ii. 6.
15. Acts xxi. 18., et seq.
16. See above, Chap. III. note 61, Chap. III. note 86, and *The Apostles.*
17. Rom. xv. 31.
18. Acts xxi. 20, et seq.
19. Acts xxiv. 17.
20. I. Cor. xvi. 1, et seq.; II. Cor. viii., ix.; Rom. xv. 26, et seq.
21. See above, Chap. X. note 71.
22. Comp. epistle of Jude, 11.
23. The objection to this hypothesis is, that we can hardly conceive that at the period of the editing of Acts, the first impression of a myth so injurious to Paul, should have been sufficiently effaced for the editor (essentially favorable to Paul) to introduce it into his recital without seeing the original sense. That he introduced it to distinguish Paul from the fictitious Simon of the Jewish-Christians, is still more improbable. The editor of the Acts strives rather to lessen than exaggerate the crime of Simon.
24. Acts xxi. 20, et seq.
25. We follow the *Vaticanus*. This verse appears to have been retouched.
26. See above, p. 89, 103, 104, 238, et seq.
27. We can not positively infer from the text of Acts that Paul himself became a Nazarite, although the latter interpretation would appear the best.

28. Jos. *Ant.* XIX. vi. 1; *Bereschith rabba* c. xcl.; *Kohleleth rabba*. vii. 11.
Talm. de ger. *Nazir*. v. 5; *Berakoth* vii. 2.
29. Acts xxi. 25, reading of Griesbach and of the admitted text.
30. Num. vi. 13, 14; Acts xxi. 24, 26, 27; Jos. B. J. II. xv. 1; Talm. of
Jerus. *Nazir*. 1, 3, and other Talmudic passages already quoted.
31. An inference of Acts xxiv. 11.
32. Especially by comparing verse xxi. 22, as given by most MSS., to xxi. 30.
33. See preceding, p. 238, et seq.
34. *Epist. 1. ad Cor.* 5.
35. Tacitus *Hist.* ii. 79. Pilate already resided there. Jos. *Ant.* XVIII.
iii. 1; B. J. II. ix. 2, 3, not habitually, however. Philo. *Leg.* 38.
36. Jos. *Ant.* XX. viii. 7, 9; B. J. II. xiii. 7; xiv. 4, et seq.; xviii. 1; III.
ix. 1; VII. iii. 1; Philo. *Leg.* 38.
37. Comp. *Cor. inscr. gr.*, No. 4528 e; *Mission de Phenicie*. p. 202.
38. Jos. B. J. V. v. 8; de Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jerusalem*, p. 52, pl. xv., xvi.
39. Acts vii. 54; xxii. 13.
40. See *Apostles*.
41. Doubt here would be allowable. The author of Acts frequently yields,
especially in his chapters, to the desire to introduce discourses, and to
attribute oratorical attitudes to the apostle (xvii. 22; xx. 18; xxi. 40;
xxiii. 1; xxiv. 10; xxv. 10; xxv. 23; xxvi. 1). No historian of
antiquity hesitates thus to attribute harangues to the principal charac-
ters of his history.
42. Both at Jerusalem and Philippi, Paul purposely allows the authorities to
get into trouble through ignorance, and does not declare his title
until they have implicated themselves. One might here suspect a
determination taken by the narrator; and one is often led to ask
himself whether the author of the Acts, always desirous of giving the
Roman right to the sect, did not upon his own authority confer the
title upon Paul. However, as these two recitals are of circumstances
witnessed by the author, we are allowed to suppose this a custom
common to Paul. Traditions in regard to Paul's death also suppose
him a Roman citizen, (Ter. *Præser.* 36). But this sort of a death
may have been inferred from the assertion of Acts. *Τρίς ἐραβδίς-
δην* (II. Cor. xi. 25), and the *στιγμάτα* (Gal. vi. 17), would
strengthen the doubt; for it is not natural that Paul should have re-
peated the scene at Philippi three times without counting the present.
The devolution of the trial of Paul upon Cæsar does not necessarily
suppose the Roman right. See Jos. *Vita.* 3. The quality of Tar-
siot constitutes a much stronger induction, Renier, *Inscr. de l'Algérie*,
No. 127 (line 26) and 721, and in Wallon. *Croyance due à l'Evan-
gile*, second edit., p. 509. Grotfend, *Imp. rom. Tib. descriptum*,
p. 149, 150.

43. Cic. *In Verr.* II. v. 62, et seq.
44. Digest XLVIII. xviii. 1.
45. Acts xxii. 30. Comp. Acts xxiii. 29.
46. The Talmud calls him *Johanan ben Nedabaï*, Johanan is equivalent in meaning to *Hanania*. *Hanan* is the abridged form.
47. Jos. *Ant.* XX. v. 4, viii. 8; Talm. de Bab. *Pesachim* 57 a; *Kerithouth* 28 a. There are difficulties against this, taken from Jos. *Ant.* XX. vi. 2; viii. 5. Perhaps Ananias, like Hanan, in the time of Jesus, preserved, after his deposition, the directing power. Cf. Jos. B. J. II. xii. 6. Derenbourg, *Palestine après les Thalmuds*, i., p. 230, et seq.
48. Talm. de Bab. *loco citato*.
49. Jos. *Ant.* xx. ix. 2. B. J. II. xvii. 9.
50. Jos. B. J. II. xii. 6. Cf. Derenbourg op. cit. p. 231, note.
51. Ex. xxii. 23.
52. For the antipathy of Pharisees against the son of Zebedee, and in general, against the high-priesthood, see Talm. de Bab., places quoted in page preceding.
53. Cf. Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 1, 3, 4; B. J. II. viii. 14.
54. We believe firmly that there is some artificial arrangement in this recital of the Acts.
55. Cf. Talm. de Jer. *Aboda zara*. i. 9.
56. *Δεξιολάβοι*, *frumentarii*. Cf. *Thes.* of H. Etienne at the word *δεξιολάβέω*.
57. Probably Kfar-Sraba. See Robinson, iii. 259.
58. *Itiner. a Burdig, Hièros*, p. 600 (Wessering).
59. For the explanation of Acts xxiv. 1, 11, see hereafter note ii., chapter xx. The journey from Cesarea to Jerusalem is not included in estimate of verse 11.
60. An inference of Acts xxiv. 23.

CHAPTER XX.

1. Tacitus *Hist.* v. 9.
2. Jos. *Ant.* xx. 1; viii. 5; B. J. II. xii. 8; Tacitus *Ann.* xii. 54; *Hist.* v. 9.
3. Suet. Claud., 28.
4. Tacitus *Hist.* v. 9.
5. Tacitus *Hist.* v. 9.
6. Tacitus *Ann.* xii. 54.

7. Jos. *Ant.* xx. viii. 5.
8. Tacitus *Hist.* v. 9.
9. Digest. XLVIII. iii. 6.
10. Digest. XLVIII. iii. *De custodia et exhibitione reorum* 1. 12, 14; Seneca *Epist.* V; Dio. of Alex. in Eus. II. E. VI. 40; Acts xxviii. 16. The passage from Manlius, *Astr.* V. 619, 620, proves little here. Compare Acts xvi. 27; xxvii. 42.
11. Acts xxix. 1. The five days are to be reckoned from the day when Paul leaves Jerusalem, as proved by Acts xxiv. 11.
12. See Freund or Forcellini at this word. St. Aug. *In Joh. Evang.* tract. XLXI. § 9.
13. Acts xxiv. 27. xxvi. 29.
14. Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. vi. 7.
15. This is the conclusion from this mission in the passage Acts xxvii. 2, (compare xx. 4); brought together with II. Tim. iv. 12; Titus iii. 12; by observing that these two latter epistles are imagined and full of inexplicable arrangements.
16. II. Tim. iv. 20. Same observation.
17. Jos. *Ant.* XX. viii. 11; *Vita* 3.
18. Tacitus *Ann.* XIII. 14.
19. Jos. B. J. II. xiv. 1.
20. Jos. *Ant.* XX. v. 11. Paul was taken to Cesarea in August, 58. Festus arrived there two years later. The remark made Acts xxvii. 9, agrees with these dates.
21. See passages *Pesachim* and *Kerithouth*, already quoted.
22. Acts xix. 21; xxiii. 11.
23. Pliny *Epist.* X. 97; Jos. *Vita* 3; Dio. Cass. LX. 17.
24. Jos. *Ant.* XX. vii. Juvenal vi. 156, et seq.
25. It is not impossible that the author of the Acts imagined this entire episode in order to show Paul setting forth his doctrine once more before the heathen world. Compare episode of the Areopagus. Acts xxiv. 24, 25. It is difficult, nevertheless, to assert that this recital is entirely without foundation. Mat. x. 18, 19; Luke xii. 11, contain allusions to these apologies pronounced by the apostle before diverse authorities.
26. See *Apostles*.
27. Acts xxvii. 2; Phil. I. i. 11, 4, 19; Col. i. 1; Phil. i.; Heb. xiii. 23.

CHAPTER XXI.

1. Determined by Acts xxvii. 9; and agreeing with the series of anterior facts.
2. For the entire voyage compare Jos. *Vita*, 3. For the technical part of the navigation, see James Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (London, 1848); Conybeare & Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, II. p. 308, et seq.
3. Now in ruins.
4. The MS. B. only has (Acts xxvii. 37), "seventy-six." Compare Jos. *Vita*, 3.
5. Also named Salmonium or Samonium.
6. Mem. (unpub.) of Mr. Thenou, on Isle of Crete.
7. See large map of Crete by Spratt, (1858 and 1862). Pococke found the little bay under consideration still bearing the name of *Λιμενὸν καλὸν*, under Cape Littinos, toward the middle of the south coast of the Isle. (*Descript. of the East*, vol. II. part 1. p. 250, 251, and the map). Several travellers saw the bay again bearing the same name. (Smith, p. 30-38, 44, 45; Conybeare & Howson, II. p. 329, 330). Messrs. Thenon and Spratt (*Travels and Researches in Crete*, II. p. 1, et seq. London, 1865) found the same. *Καλοὶ Λιμνιόνες*, or *Kalo-Limniones* again, and before the little island which closes the Good Havens, a little to the east; a point with ruins, projecting into the and called by the peasants *Lascea*. This second name comes probably from a recent identification, a work of the monks or teachers who have visited the topography of the Acts in these latitudes. A large convent situated near by proves that at an early day Christian recollections attached themselves to this place. There are few ports on the south coast of Crete, and supposing the expression *Καλοὶ Λιμνιόνες* to be the result of subsequent identification, there is but little choice. However, it may be, *Λαῶσια*, *Λαῶσα*, *Αλαῶσα*, probably correspond to *Ὀλυσσὴν* or *Αἰῶσσην* of Strabo, (x. iv. 14), to *Αἰῶσση* of Stephen of Byzantium, (at the word *Φαιστός*) to *Lysia* of Peutinger's map.
8. Vegetius IV. 38; Horace Od. I. iv.; III. vii. 2, et seq.; Hesiod *Op. et dies*. 670, et seq.; Aristoph. *Aves*, 712; Philo. Leg. §3; Comp. Titus iii. 12.
9. Strabo, X. iv. 2; Ptol. III. xvii. 3. Now Loutro, port of the Sphakiotēs. See Spratt *Travels*, II. p. 247, et seq., and his map. Smith, *Shipwreck*, p. 51; Pashley, *Travels in Crete*, II. 259; Conybeare & Howson, II. p. 231, et seq. It is difficult to justify *Βλεποντα κατὰ λαβὰ καὶ κατὰ χῶρον*.

10. *Gregalia* of the Levantines is this same word *euroclydon* (as *Euripe* has made *Egripon*). See Conybeare & Howson, II. p. 336; Spratt II. p. 11, et seq.
11. Also called Claudos or Gaudos. Now Gafda or Gando or Gaudonesi, or Gozzo. Not to be confounded with Gozzo near Malta.
12. Conf. Thuey I. xxix. 8; and Greek Dicts. at word *υποζωμα*. Conf. Conybeare & Howson II. 311, et seq.
13. Acts xxvii. 27; Jos. *Vita*, 3; Hor. Od. I. iii. 15; Ovid. *Fastes*, IV. 501; *Tristes* I. xi. 4; Ptol. Geogr. III. xv. 2; VIII. ix. 2; xii. 2; Pau; sanias, V. xxv. 3; Procop. *Bell. Vand.* I. 14; *De aedif.* IV. 1.
14. Smith, *Shipwreck*, p. 92, et seq.; Conybeare & Howson II. p. 245, 346.
15. See pictures of vessels so numerous on sculptured monuments of antiquity; in particular in the paintings of Hercl.; in the Virgil of the Vatican. Consult, for instance, *Dict. de l'Acad. de beaux arts*, II. p. 337; Gal. *Gloss. nautique*, at the words *barca duorum thimonarum*, *barre du gouvernail*; W. Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiqs.*; article *navis* Martin & Cahier *Mel. d'archeol.* III. pl. 1; B. Graser *De veterum re navali*; (Berlin, 1864); tab. iv. and v. *ibid.* *Die Gemmen des Koen. Museum zu Berlin mit Darstellungen antiker Schiffe* (Berlin, 1867), pl. I. and II.
16. The narrator yields to the very natural temptation of exaggerating the rôle of Paul.
17. Concerning the true meaning of *αρτεμων*, see II. Etienne Freund, Gal. at words *αρτεμων*, *artimon*, and *artemon*, etc. See also coins of Commodus, of the type No. 715 of Cohen. *Med. imp.* III. pl. ii.; Gal. *Gloss. naut.* I. p. 256; Conybeare & Howson, I. p. 56; II. p. 317; Graser *Gemmen* p. 9, 11, 19, 21; pl. i. and ii. The little sloping mast of vessels seen on the numerous coins of Hadrian, of Lucius Verus, of Commodus, of the city of Godara, appears to be a bowsprit or a flag staff. Comp. Gaser, l. c. W. Smith, l. c.
18. The *Cala di san Paolo* at Malta (see chart of Eng. Admir.) corresponds well to the Acts. The isle of Salmonetta or Gzeier would be the *τοπος διδρα λαοσος*. See Smith, p. 19, et seq. Conybeare and Howson, II. p. 351, et seq.
19. Cic. *In Verrem*, II. iv. 46. Diod. de Sic. V. xii. 2, 4. Ovid. *Fastes* III. 567. Silius Italicus XIV. 251. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 5754. Henzen No. 6124. The inscripts. of Malta are Punic, Greek, and Latin.
20. Comp. Mar. xvi. 18.
21. () *πρωτος της ρηθου*. Comp. *Corp. inscr. gr.* No. 5754, but not MEL. PRIMVS, of the inscription of Henzen N. 6124, where *Melitenium* is governed by what precedes, and *primus* governs what follows, contrary to the idea of Ciantar. Note the Latin names of the two *principes*.

22. The common language of the island then was Punic, Acts xxviii. 2, 4.
23. Strabo, XVII. 1, 7; Pliny, XXXVI. 14; Suet. *Aug.* 98; Jos. *Cita* 3; Philo. *In Flacc.* §5.
24. Now St. Donato.
25. Cic. *Ad Att.* II. 10, 11, 13; *Itincr. Anton.* p. 107, edit. Wesseling, Now Cisterna.
26. Borghesi, *Fastes cons.* (still unpub.) at year 61.

CHAPTER XXII.

1. Acts xx. 25.
2. Rom. xv. 19, 20. Compare Acts xx. 25-27; Col. i. 6, and above all, 23.
3. We can suppose that the salutations of Rom. xvi. 3-16 include nearly all the church of Paul at Ephesus. Paul salutes particularly twenty-six persons; he mentions three domestic churches, and twice he employs the formula *καὶ τοὺς ὄντες αὐτοῖς*. Reckoning twenty for each domestic church, and ten for those comprised in the formulas *καὶ τοὺς ὄντες αὐτοῖς*, we make the church of Ephesus of 100-120 persons. The church of Corinth must have been less numerous, since it only formed a simple *ecclesia*, which was all held in one house. (Rom. xvi. 23 Greek text.) Let us reckon 200 Christians in Macedonia, 200-300 for the churches of Galatia, there still remain to reach 1000, the number of 300, 400 which is apparently more than sufficient to cover the churches of Athens, Troas, Cyprus, and other secondary groups.
4. Cf. *Apostles*, and p. 201, 202, 220, et seq.
5. The group from which issued the epistles either authentic or apocryphal, of Clement Roman, Ignatius and Polycarp.
6. A fact very apparent with the author of the Acts. See *Apostles*.
7. See especially, Acts xx. 10, et seq.; xxvii. 21, et seq.
8. The expression "St. Peter and St. Paul," is common; but that of St. Paul alone, is rather rare. St. Pol de Leon, St. Paul of Narbonne, are local saints.
9. The recitals relative to St. Trophimus and to St. Crescent are less legends, than intentional misconstructions put upon history, in order to gratify the vanity of certain churches.
10. See especially, Phil. iii. 2. The work which resembles most in spirit the epistle to the Galatians is the *De captivitate babylonica Ecclesia*.

1873.

1873.

G. W. CARLETON & Co

NEW BOOKS

AND NEW EDITIONS,
RECENTLY ISSUED BY
G. W. CARLETON & Co., Publishers,
Madison Square, New York.

The Publishers, upon receipt of the price in advance, will send any book on this Catalogue by mail, *postage free*, to any part of the United States.

All books in this list [unless otherwise specified] are handsomely bound in cloth board binding, with gilt backs, suitable for libraries.

Mary J. Holmes' Works.

Tempest and Sunshine.....	\$1 50	Darkness and Daylight.....	\$1 50
English Orphans.....	1 50	Hugh Worthington.....	1 50
Homestead on the Hillside.....	1 50	Cameron Pride.....	1 50
'Lena Rivers.....	1 50	Rose Mather.....	1 50
Meadow Brook.....	1 50	Ethelyn's Mistake.....	1 50
Dora Deane.....	1 50	Millbank.....	1 50
Cousin Maude.....	1 50	Edna Browning.....	1 50
Marian Gray.....	1 50	West Lawn.....(new)	1 50

Marion Harland's Works.

Alone.....	\$1 50	Sunnybank.....	\$1 50
Hidden Path.....	1 50	Husbands and Homes.....	1 50
Moss Side.....	1 50	Ruby's Husband.....	1 50
Nemesis.....	1 50	Phemie's Temptation.....	1 50
Miriam.....	1 50	The Empty Heart.....	1 50
At Last.....	1 50	Jessamine.....	1 50
Helen Gardner.....	1 50	From My Youth Up....(new).....	1 50
True as Steel..... (new).....	1 50		

Charles Dickens—15 Vols.—"Carleton's Edition."

Pickwick, and Catalogue...	\$1 50	David Copperfield.....	\$1 50
Domby and Son.....	1 50	Nicholas Nickleby.....	1 50
Bleak House.....	1 50	Little Dorrit.....	1 50
Martin Chuzzlewit.....	1 50	Our Mutual Friend.....	1 50
Barnaby Rudge—Edwin Drood..	1 50	Curiosity Shop—Miscellaneous..	1 50
Child's England—Miscellaneous.	1 50	Sketches by Boz—Hard Times...	1 50
Oliver Twist—and—The Uncommercial Traveller.....	7 50		
Great Expectations—and—Pictures of Italy and America.....	1 50		
Christmas Books —and—A Tale of Two Cities.....	1 50		
Sets of Dickens' Complete Works, in 15 vols.—[elegant half calf bindings]..	60 00		

Augusta J. Evans' Novels.

Beulah.....	\$1 75	St. Elmo.....	\$2 00
Macaria.....	1 75	Vashti.....	2 00
Inez.....	1 75	Infelice.....(new).....	2 00

Miriam Coles Harris.

Rutledge.....	\$1 50	The Sutherlands.....	\$1 50
Frank Warrington.....	1 50	St. Philip's.....	1 50
Louie's Last Term, etc.	1 50	Round Hearts, for Children	1 50
Richard Vandermark.....	1 50	A Perfect Adonis.—(New)....	1 50

May Agnes Fleming's Novels.

Guy Earlscount's Wife.....	\$1 75	A Wonderful Woman.....	1 75
A Terrible Secret.....	1 75	A Mad Marriage.....(new)....	1 75
Norine's Revenge. (In press)	1 75		

Julie P. Smith's Novels.

Widow Goldsmith's Daughter ..	\$1 75	The Widower.....	\$1 75
Chris and Otho.....	1 75	The Married Belle.....	1 75
Ten Old Maids.....(new).....	1 75	Courting and Farming. (In press).	1 75

Captain Mayo Reid—Illustrated.

The Scalp Hunters.....	\$1 50	The White Chief.....	\$1 50
The Rifle Rangers.....	1 50	The Tiger Hunter.....	1 50
The War Trail ..	1 50	The Hunter's Feast.....	1 50
The Wood Rangers.....	1 50	Wild Life.....	1 50
The Wild Huntress ..	1 50	Osceola, the Seminole.....	1 50

A. S. Roe's Select Stories.

True to the Last.....	\$1 50	A Long Look Ahead.....	\$1 50
The Star and the Cloud.....	1 50	I've Been Thinking.....	1 50
How Could He help It?.....	1 50	To Love and to be Loved.....	1 50

Charles Dickens.

Child's History of England.—Carleton's New "School Edition." Illustrated..	\$1 25
--	--------

Hand-Books of Society.

Habits of Good Society.—The nice points of taste and good manners.....	\$1 50
Art of Conversation.—For those who wish to be agreeable talkers or listeners	1 50
Art of Writing, Reading, and Speaking.—For self-improvement	1 50
New Diamond Edition.—Small size, elegantly bound, 3 volumes in a box	3 00

Mrs. Hill's Cook Book.

Mrs A. P. Hill's New Cookery Book, and family domestic receipts.....	\$2 00
--	--------

Famous Books—"Carleton's Edition."

Robinson Crusoe.—An elegant new 12mo edition, with characteristic illustrations by ERNEST GRISSET.....	\$1 50
Swiss Family Robinson.—An elegant new 12mo edition, with characteristic illustrations by MARCKL.....	1 50
The Arabian Nights.—An elegant new 12mo edition, with characteristic illustrations by DEMORAINE.....	1 50
Don Quixote.—An elegant new 12mo edition, with characteristic illustrations by GUSTAVE DORÉ.....	1 50

Victor Hugo.

Les Miserables.—An English translation from the original French. Octavo.....	\$2 50
Les Miserables.—In the Spanish Language. Two volumes, cloth bound.....	5 00

Popular Italian Novels.

Doctor Antonio.—A love story of Italy. By Ruffini	\$1 75
Beatrice Cenci.—By Guerrazzi. With a steel engraving from Guido's Picture....	1 75
Manfred.—By the Author of "Beatrice Cenci." Translated by Luigi Monti.....	1 75

M. Michelet's Remarkable Works.

Love (L'amour).—English translation from the original French	\$1 50
Woman (La Femme).....Do.....Do.....Do.....	1 50

Popular Novels, from the French.

She Loved Him Madly.—Borys..	\$1 75	So Fair Yet False.—By Chavette ..	\$1 75
A Fatal Passion.—By Bernard....	1 75	Through Thick and Thin.—Meiy.	1 75
Led Astray.—Octave Feuillet....	1 75		

Johnny Ludlow.

A clever and amusing collection of capital New English Stories.....	\$1 50
---	--------

Artomus Ward's Comic Works.

A New Stereotype Edition.—Embracing the whole of his writings, with a Biography of the author, and profusely illustrated.....\$1 00

Charlotte Bronte.

Shirley.—By the author of "Jane Eyre." With an illustration.....\$1 75

Ernest Renan's French Works.

The Life of Jesus.....\$1 75	Life of Saint Paul.....\$1 75
Lives of the Apostles.....1 75	Bible in India.—By Jacolliot.....2 00

Geo. W. Carleton.

Our Artist in Cuba.—Pictures.....\$1 50	Our Artist in Africa. (In press.)...\$1 50
Our Artist in Peru.—Do.1 50	Our Artist in Mexico. Do.1 50

Fanny Fern's Works.

Folly as it Flies.....\$1 50	Caper-Sauce.....(new).....\$1 50
Gingersnaps.....1 50	A Memorial.—By James Parton...2 00

Josh Billings' Comic Works.

Josh Billings' Proverbs.....\$1 50	Josh Billings' Farmer's Almanax, 25 cts.
Josh Billings on Ice.....1 50	(In paper covers.)

Verdant Green.

A racy English college story—with numerous comic illustrations.....\$1 50

Algernon Charles Swinburne.

Laus Veneris, and Other Poems.—An elegant new edition.....\$1 50

French Love-Songs.—Selected from the best French authors.....1 50

Robert Dale Owen.

The Debatable Land Between this World and the Next.....\$2 00

Threading My Way.—Twenty-five years of Autobiography.....1 50

The Game of Whist.

Pole on Whist.—The late English standard work.....\$1 00

Mother Goose Set to Music.

Mother Goose Melodies.—With music for singing, and many illustrations.....\$1 50

M. M. Pomeroy "Brick."

Sense—(a serious book).....\$1 50	Nonsense—(a comic book).....\$1 50
Gold-Dust Do.1 50	Brick-Dust Do.1 50
Our Saturday Nights.....1 50	Life of M. M. Pomeroy.....1 50

Joseph Rodman Drake.

The Culprit Fay.—The well-known fairy poem, with 100 illustrations.....\$2 00

The Culprit Fay. Do.suberly bound in turkey morocco. 6 00

Richard B. Kimball.

Was He Successful?\$1 75	Life in San Domingo.....\$1 50
Undercurrents of Wall Street....1 75	Henry Powers, Banker.....1 75
Saint Leger.....1 75	To-Day.....1 75
Romance of Student Life.....1 75	Emilie. (In press.) ..

Celia E. Gardner's Novels.

Stolen Waters—(in verse).....\$1 50	Tested.....(in prose).....\$1 75
Broken Dreams Do.1 50	Rich Medway's Two Loves Do.1 75

Mrs. N. S. Emerson.

Betsey and I are Out—And other Poems. A Thanksgiving Story.....\$1 50

Louisa M. Alcott.

Morning Glories—A beautiful juvenile, by the author of "Little Women.".....\$1 50

Geo. A. Crofutt.

Trans-Continental Tourist from New York to San Francisco.—Illustrated ..\$1 50

Miscellaneous Works.

How to Make Money; and How to Keep It.—By Thomas A. Davies.....	\$1 50
Tales from the Operas.—A collection of Stories based upon the plots.	1 50
New Nonsense Rhymes.—By W. H. Beckett, with illustrations by C. G. Bush..	1 00
Wood's Guide to the City of New York.—Beautifully illustrated.....	1 00
The Art of Amusing.—A book of home amusements, with illustrations.....	1 50
A Book About Lawyers.—A curious and interesting volume. By Jeaffreson....	2 00
A Book About Doctors. Do. Do. Do.	2 00
The Birth and Triumph of Love.—Full of exquisite tinted illustrations.....	1 00
Progressive Petticoats.—A satirical tale by Robert B. Roosevelt.....	1 50
Ecce Femina; or, The Woman Zoe.—Cuyler Pine, author "Mary Brandegee."	1 50
Women and Theatres.—A bright and readable book by Olive Logan.....	1 50
Souvenirs of Travel.—By Madame Octavia Walton Le Vert.....	2 00
Woman, Love and Marriage.—A spicy little work by Fred Saunders.....	1 50
Shiftless Folks.—A brilliant new novel by Fannie Smith.....	1 75
A Woman in Armor.—A powerful new novel by Mary Hartwell.....	1 50
Female Beauty and the Art of Pleasing.—From the French.....	1 50
Transformation Scenes in the United States.—By Hiram Fuller.....	1 50
The Fall of Man.—A Darwinian satire. By author "New Gospel Peace.".....	50
The Chronicles of Gotham.—A modern satire. Do. Do.	25
The Story of a Summer.—Journal Leaves by Cecelia Cleveland.....	1 50
Phemie Frost's Experiences.—By Mrs. Ann S. Stephens.....	1 75

Miscellaneous Novels.

A Charming Widow.—Macquoid.....	\$1 75	Four Oaks.—Kamba Thorpe.....	\$1 75
True to Him Ever.—By F. W. R.	1 50	Maurice.—From the French.....	1 50
The Forgiven Kiss.—By M. Loth.	1 75	Purple and Fine Linen.—Fawcett..	1 50
Loyal Unto Death.....	1 75	Faustina.—From the German....	1 50
Bessie Wilmerton.—Westcott.....	1 75	Adrift with a Vengeance.....	1 50
Cachet.—Mrs. M. J. R. Hamilton... ..	1 75	Adrift in Dixie.—Edmund Kirke ..	1 50
Mark Gildersleeve.—J. S. Sauzade.	1 75	Among the Guerillas.— Do.	1 50
Crown Jewels.—Mrs. Moffat.....	1 75	Among the Pines.— Do.	1 50
Avery Glibun.—Orpheus C. Kerr... ..	2 00	My Southern Friends.— Do.	1 50
The Cloven Foot.— Do.	1 50	Down in Tennessee.— Do.	1 50
Romance of Railroad.—Smith.....	1 50	Ebon and Gold.—C. L. McIlvaine... ..	1 50
Fairfax.—John Esten Cooke.....	1 50	Robert Greathouse.—J. F. Swift.	2 00
Hilt to Hilt.— Do.	1 50	Warwick.—By M. T. Walworth....	1 75
Out of the Foam.—	1 50	Lulu.— Do.	1 75
Hammer and Rapier.—	1 50	Hotspur.— Do.	1 75
Kenneth, My King.—S. A. Brock.. ..	1 75	Stormcliff.— Do.	1 75
Heart Hungry.—M. J. Westmoreland ..	1 75	Delaplain.— Do.	1 75
Clifford Troupe.— Do.	1 75	Beverly.— Do.	1 75

Miscellaneous Works.

Beldazzle's Bachelor Studies.....	\$1 00	Northern Ballads.—Anderson,....	\$1 00
Little Wanderers.—Illustrated....	1 50	O. C. Kerr Papers.—4 vols. in 1... ..	2 00
Genesis Disclosed.—T. A. Davies.. ..	1 50	Victor Hugo.—His life.....	2 00
Commodore Rollingpin's Log....	1 50	Beauty is Power.....	1 50
Brazen Gates.—A juvenile	1 50	Sandwiches.—Artemus Ward.....	25 cts.
Antidote to Gates Ajar.....	25 cts.	Widow Spriggins.—Widow Bedott.	1 75
The Snoblace Ball Do.	25 cts.	Squibob Papers.—John Phoenix....	1 50

Miscellaneous Works.

Bill Arp's Peace Papers.—Full of comic illustrations.....	\$1 50
A Book of Epitaphs.—Amusing, quaint, and curious. (New.).....	1 50
Ballad of Lord Bateaman.—With illustrations by Cruikshank (paper).....	25 cts.
The Yachtman's Primer.—For amateur sailors. T. R. Warren (paper).....	50 cts.
Rural Architecture.—By M. Field. With plans and illustrations.....	2 00
What I Know of Farming.—By Horace Greeley.. ..	1 50
Twelve Views of Heaven.—By Twelve Distinguished English Divines.....	1 50
Houses Not Made With Hands.—A juvenile, illustrated by Hoppin.....	1 00
Impending Crisis of the South.—By Hinton Rowan Helper....	2 00

CHARLES DICKENS' WORKS.

A New Edition.

Among the many editions of the works of this greatest of English Novelists, there has not been until now *one* that entirely satisfies the public demand.—Without exception, they each have some strong distinctive objection,—either the form and dimensions of the volumes are unhandy—or, the type is small and indistinct—or, the illustrations are unsatisfactory—or, the binding is poor—or, the price is too high.

An entirely new edition is *now*, however, published by G. W. Carleton & Co. of New York, which, it is believed, will, in every respect, completely satisfy the popular demand.—It is known as

“Carleton’s New Illustrated Edition.”

COMPLETE IN 15 VOLUMES.

The size and form is most convenient for holding,—the type is entirely new, and of a clear and open character that has received the approval of the reading community in other popular works.

The illustrations are by the original artists chosen by Charles Dickens himself—and the paper, printing, and binding are of an attractive and substantial character.

This beautiful new edition is complete in 15 volumes—at the extremely reasonable price of \$1.50 per volume, as follows:—

- 1.—PICKWICK PAPERS AND CATALOGUE.
- 2.—OLIVER TWIST.—UNCOMMERCIAL TRAVELLER.
- 3.—DAVID COPPERFIELD.
- 4.—GREAT EXPECTATIONS.—ITALY AND AMERICA.
- 5.—DOMBEY AND SON.
- 6.—BARNABY RUDGE AND EDWIN DROOD.
- 7.—NICHOLAS NICKLEBY.
- 8.—CURIOSITY SHOP AND MISCELLANEOUS.
- 9.—BLEAK HOUSE.
- 10.—LITTLE DORRIT.
- 11.—MARTIN CHUZZLEWIT.
- 12.—OUR MUTUAL FRIEND.
- 13.—CHRISTMAS BOOKS.—TALE OF TWO CITIES.
- 14.—SKETCHES BY BOZ AND HARD TIMES.
- 15.—CHILD’S ENGLAND AND MISCELLANEOUS.

The first volume—Pickwick Papers—contains an alphabetical catalogue of all of Charles Dickens’ writings, with their positions in the volumes.

This edition is sold by Booksellers, everywhere—and single specimen copies will be forwarded by mail, *postage free*, on receipt of price, \$1.50, by

G. W. CARLETON & CO., Publishers,

Madison Square, New York.

THREE VALUABLE BOOKS,

All Beautifully Printed and Elegantly Bound.

I.—The Art of Conversation,

With Directions for Self-Culture. An admirably conceived and entertaining work—sensible, instructive, and full of suggestions valuable to every one who desires to be either a good taker or listener, or who wishes to appear to advantage in good society. Every young and even old person should read it, study it over and over again, and follow those hints in it which lead them to break up bad habits and cultivate good ones. *.* Price \$1.50. Among the contents will be found chapters upon—

ATTENTION IN CONVERSATION.—SATIRE.—PUNS.—SARCASM.—TEASING.—CENSURE.—FAULT-FINDING.—EGOTISM.—POLITENESS.—COMPLIMENTS.—STORIES.—ANECDOTES.—QUESTIONING.—LIBERTIES.—IMPUDENCE.—STARING.—DISAGREEABLE SUBJECTS.—SEL-

FISHNESS.—ARGUMENT.—SACRIFICES.—SILENT PEOPLE.—DINNER CONVERSATION.—TIMIDITY.—ITS CURE.—MODESTY.—CORRECT LANGUAGE.—SELF-INSTRUCTION.—MISCELLANEOUS KNOWLEDGE.—LANGUAGES.

II.—The Habits of Good Society.

A Handbook for Ladies and Gentlemen. With thoughts, hints, and anecdotes concerning social observances, nice points of taste and good manners, and the art of making oneself agreeable. The whole interspersed with humorous illustrations of social predicaments, remarks on fashion, etc. *.* Price \$1.50. Among the contents will be found chapters upon—

GENTLEMEN'S PREFACE.
LADIES' PREFACE.—FASHIONS.
THOUGHTS ON SOCIETY.
GOOD SOCIETY.—BAD SOCIETY.
THE DRESSING-ROOM.
THE LADIES' TOILET.—DRESS.
FEMININE ACCOMPLISHMENTS.
MANNERS AND HABITS.
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ETIQUETTE.
MARRIED AND UNMARRIED LADIES.
DO DO GENTLEMEN.
CALLING ETIQUETTE.—CARDS.
VISITING ETIQUETTE.—DINNERS.
DINNER PARTIES.

LADIES AT DINNER.
DINNER HABITS.—CARVING.
MANNERS AT SUPPER.—BALLS.
MORNING PARTIES.—PICNICS.
EVENING PARTIES.—DANCES.
PRIVATE THEATRICALS.
RECEPTIONS.—ENGAGEMENTS.
MARRIAGE CEREMONIES.
INVITATIONS.—DRESSES.
BRIDESMAIDS.—PRESENTS.
TRAVELLING ETIQUETTE.
PUBLIC PROMENADE.
COUNTRY VISITS.—CITY VISITS.

III.—Arts of Writing, Reading, and Speaking.

An exceedingly fascinating work for teaching not only the beginner, but for perfecting every one in these three most desirable accomplishments. For youth this book is both interesting and valuable; and for adults, whether professionally or socially, it is a book that they cannot dispense with. *.* Price \$1.50. Among the contents will be found chapters upon—

READING & THINKING.—LANGUAGE.—WORDS, SENTENCES, & CONSTRUCTION.
WHAT TO AVOID.—LETTER WRITING.—PRONUNCIATION.—EXPRESSION.—TONE
RELIGIOUS READINGS.—THE BIBLE.—PRAYERS.—DRAMATIC READINGS.—THE ACTOR & READER.—FOUNDATIONS FOR ORATORY AND SPEAKING.—WHAT TO

SAY.—WHAT NOT TO SAY.—HOW TO BEGIN.—CAUTIONS.—DELIVERY.—WRITING A SPEECH.—FIRST LESSONS.—PUBLIC SPEAKING.—DELIVERY.—ACTION.
ORATORY OF THE PULPIT.—COMPOSITION.—THE BAR.—READING OF WIT & HUMOR.—THE PLATFORM.—CONSTRUCTION OF A SPEECH.

These works are the most perfect of their kind ever published; fresh, sensible, good-humored, entertaining, and readable. Every person of taste should possess them, and cannot be otherwise than delighted with them.

A beautiful new miniature edition of these very popular books has just been published, entitled "THE DIAMOND EDITION," three little volumes, elegantly printed on tinted paper, and handsomely bound in a box. Price \$3.00.

. These books are all sent by mail, postage free, on receipt of price, by

G. W. CARLETON & CO., Publishers, Madison Square, New York.

MARY J. HOLMES' WORKS.



- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1.—TEMPEST AND SUNSHINE. | 8.—MARIAN GRAY. |
| 2.—ENGLISH ORPHANS. | 9.—DARKNESS AND DAYLIGHT. |
| 3.—HOMESTEAD ON HILLSIDE. | 10.—HUGH WORTHINGTON. |
| 4.—LENA RIVERS. | 11.—CAMERON PRIDE. |
| 5.—MEADOW BROOK. | 12.—ROSE MATHER. |
| 6.—DORA DEANE. | 13.—ETHELYN'S MISTAKE. |
| 7.—COUSIN MAUDE. | 14.—MILLBANK. |
| | 15.—EDNA BROWNING. |

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Mrs. Holmes' stories are universally read. Her admirers are numberless. She is in many respects without a rival in the world of fiction. Her characters are always life-like, and she makes them talk and act like human beings, subject to the same emotions, swayed by the same passions, and actuated by the same motives which are common among men and women of every day existence. Mrs. Holmes is very happy in portraying domestic life. Old and young peruse her stories with great delight, for she writes in a style that all can comprehend."—*New York Weekly*.

"Mrs. Holmes' stories are all of a domestic character, and their interest, therefore, is not so intense as if they were more highly seasoned with sensationalism, but it is of a healthy and abiding character. Almost any new book which her publisher might choose to announce from her pen would get an immediate and general reading. The interest in her tales begins at once, and is maintained to the close. Her sentiments are so sound, her sympathies so warm and ready, and her knowledge of manners, character, and the varied incidents of ordinary life is so thorough, that she would find it difficult to write any other than an excellent tale if she were to try it."—*Boston Banner*.

"Mrs. Holmes is very amusing; has a quick and true sense of humor, a sympathetic tone, a perception of character, and a familiar, attractive style, pleasantly adapted to the comprehension and the taste of that large class of American readers for whom fashionable novels and ideal fantasies have no charm."—*Henry T. Tuckerman*.

THE volumes are all handsomely printed and bound in cloth, - sold everywhere, and sent by mail, *postage free*, on receipt of price [\$1.50 each]. by

G. W. CARLETON & CO., Publishers,

Madison Square, New York

Date Due

N 28 '38

F 17 39

10

F 6 47

01527

FACULTY

005-28

AP 1-54

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~REDACTED~~




$$\begin{array}{r}
 23.50 \\
 15.00 \\
 1.50 \\
 \hline
 20.00 \\
 20.00 \\
 \hline
 2
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r}
 3.46.00 \\
 15.00 \\
 \hline
 281.00
 \end{array}$$

BW935 .R395 v.3
The History of the origins of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00075 7700

